

THE .
WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLVI. No. 1.—JULY 1901.

THE ERADICATION OF BOVINE
TUBERCULOSIS.

THE time for taking the steps necessary to eradicate tuberculosis in cattle has at length arrived. The time of experiment and inquiry is past—the time of conflicting opinions and of Royal Commissions—and we at last stand on the firm ground of knowledge and fact. We know about this disease all that is necessary to give us full power over it. We know that it is not a hereditary evil in cattle, but that it is acquired by thoroughly sound animals through their being brought into contact with such as are diseased; that even contact with diseased animals does not necessarily mean infection to those that are sound, unless under the unfavourable conditions—which are the conditions usually obtaining—of overcrowding and almost continuous boxing up of the cattle in low, dark, unventilated, insanitary byres; that, given these conditions with tuberculosis present in any of the herd, the strongest and soundest animal cannot long remain unaffected? These things we know: that no sound animal should ever develop tuberculosis, and that even the offspring of tuberculous parents should never become affected if kept under reasonably healthy conditions. What more is there left for us to learn? Nothing. Nothing, at any rate, that could be of use to us in our endeavour to stamp out the disease. All that is left for us to do is to apply the knowledge we possess, and so, by the employment of the right means, get rid of this evil for ever.

There is no need here to enter fully into the question of how far tuberculosis in cattle does injury to the human race. Every one

who is in the least interested in the matter knows that this is one of the most fruitful causes of all kinds of tubercular disease in man. It is evident that the drinking of quantities of tubercle-tainted milk is more or less innocuous to the ordinarily healthy person—the probability being that, as the health is good, the milk consumed helps to supply nourishment sufficient to render the system tubercle-proof; if it were otherwise, almost every person in this country would die of some form of tuberculosis, for it is certain that nearly every quart of milk consumed contains tubercle-germs, since there is scarcely a byre in the length and breadth of the land in which one or more cows would not be found to be affected. The milk from these tuberculous cows is mixed indiscriminately with the rest of the milking. As it is, perhaps, it is not too much to say that every second person is tuberculous in some respect or other, although he may not be aware of it, and there is but needed a sufficiently lengthened condition of life adverse to health in order to develop the disease into evidence. In the case of children, especially if badly nourished, and weakly adults, this tubercle-laden milk is an ever-present and often fatal danger.¹ This is clearly seen from the fact that children, who, as time goes on, are more and more fed from the objectionable feeding-bottle, are the only part of the community in which tuberculosis is on the increase.² Is it, then, the attitude of a wise people to let months and years go by without doing anything in earnest to check the spread of this disease in cattle? Is it that we, the richest nation the world has ever seen, fear the necessary expenditure? Is it that those on whom the doing of the work would devolve shirk the labour of undertaking it? Or is it that we are so enamoured of liberty—of other people's liberty, we do not think of our own—that we hesitate to enforce such measures as the public good demands? One could not take Lord Salisbury seriously—although he was half in earnest—when he spoke, at the Marl-

¹ The advocacy of the sterilisation of milk is very well in its way, but it is after all but a beating of the air; the masses will never be induced to take the necessary trouble, and besides it is beginning the work of reform at the wrong end, and is countenancing rather than discouraging the continuation of things as they are. And moreover the quality and nourishing properties of milk are impaired by pasteurisation and sterilisation; and milk so treated is not by any means such a good food, especially for children, as is fresh milk. Few mothers know how to properly feed their infants, many feeding them on starchy and other indigestible foods, and even on soup, potatoes, and beef! It has been well suggested that a paper on the proper feeding of infants and young children should be given by the registrars to parents at the time of the registration of births. It would be productive of infinitely more good to spend one's energies in advocating the establishment of such dairy conditions as would go to produce, to a certainty, such milk as would need no sterilisation.

² Virchow, who is, perhaps, the greatest living pathologist, after stating that children are always born tubercle-free, even of tuberculous parents, and that tuberculosis, not being hereditary, is acquired from outside sources, says: "How must we act in order to protect the hitherto healthy infants? This is the true science of precautionary methods, and it commends itself to every mother, every hospital, every orphanage. With such a prophylaxis we should be able to obtain healthy generations. As regards measures for future adoption, my opinion is that a great part of the danger can be turned aside as soon as we manage to solve the milk question in a manner that will, to some extent, satisfy the claims of science."

borough House meeting, of not wishing to hurt the susceptibilities of the conscientious objector. Who has a right to object in such a case? Where is the justice to the overwhelming majority whose lives are at the mercy of the unscrupulous and the careless? Nor can one think that Lord Salisbury had given the matter due consideration when he said that it was not for the Government to interfere. Any one who studies the question is forced to the conclusion that the only hope of permanent improvement is for the State to take the matter in hand. The forthcoming Congress on Tuberculosis, to be held in London in July, has a splendid opportunity of forcing the hand of the Government by its members insisting that this is pre-eminently a Government matter. More good will result in one year from an organised general attack—after tuberculosis of every kind has been made a notifiable disease—than would result in ten years from the desultory skirmishes of a few half-hearted inter-bickering corporate bodies thinly scattered throughout the country.

The injection of tuberculin is an almost unfailing test of the presence of tuberculosis in cattle. It is safe to say, that for all practical purposes it may be thoroughly relied upon. We have thus an easy means of separating the diseased animals from those that are sound. In this lies the solution of the whole question. For present purposes it will be sufficient to consider the case of dairy cows—for what applies to them will apply equally to all other cattle—as among them will be found almost all the affected animals. It is a notable fact that it is comparatively rare to find tuberculosis in cattle kept much in the open. This is why horses are so little subject to tuberculosis—they live an outdoor life; but if they be kept closed up in crowded stables, without adequate outdoor work, they are as liable to the disease as are dairy cattle. It is therefore only necessary to speak of these latter, as that will practically cover the field of treatment. Milk certainly is the chief source of danger. Diseased meat is also dangerous, but in a much less degree, as proper cooking renders it harmless, though we cannot always be sure that it gets properly cooked.

The problem that presents itself for solution is a complicated one, owing to the many interests involved, but it is not of such magnitude as to deter us. Let us suppose that it has been decided by the State to undertake the eradication of tuberculosis in cattle—how should we proceed?

The first step would be the complete segregation of all tuberculous cattle. These diseased animals would be kept quite apart from the sound as far as the limits of the farm would permit, and would be treated as shall afterwards be indicated. We would thus have left in our byres none but sound animals. In the next place, these byres—which should never be allowed to exist in a town—

would have the careful attention of the authorities. Many of them would be partially pulled down, and rebuilt in accordance with more advanced ideas, and with the knowledge of what is necessary for the health of the cattle. Stockowners would be helped by the State in this matter. Thus it would be insured that all byres would be habitable, with sufficiency of air, light, high ceilings, adequate breathing room before each animal's head, and a sufficient cubic space, standing and lying room in the byre for each. The windows would be made to open, and, if possible, some of them would be in the roof, so that there might be plenty of light, and they would be so constructed that they could not be completely closed, even in mid-winter. It used to be believed—and is still believed by some—that cattle fatten quicker in the dark than in the light, and so it is no wonder that most old byres—but to see which makes one shudder—have not a vestige of an opening, save the door, which is always kept closed, by which to admit light and air. Our forefathers had no idea what a sanitary agent light is; and how ever did they see to clean out these Gehennas? There is an idea abroad that cows must be kept in warm, close byres, otherwise they will not give sufficient milk. This idea may have some truth in it, but it is a pernicious idea none the less. It is at the root of this evil we are now trying to combat, and I will, as we proceed, endeavour to show that owners of cattle and other animals, by fearing abundance of fresh air and a natural life in the open for their stock, are in the surest way, by these means, inducing in the animals those very diseases which they are thus trying to avert. It cannot be detrimental in the long run to let cattle have some of that pure air which is so necessary to the proper sustenance of all animal life. If the temperature of the byre were reduced by a proper system of ventilation, which need not at all be elaborate—simple window and other openings in walls and roof being the best of all means for ventilating—there might be, at first, a slight diminution in milk-giving power, but the cows would become healthier and hardier, until, in no long time, it would be the natural thing for them to live in well-ventilated houses, and the full milk-giving power would return. At the same time the milk of these stronger, healthier cattle would be richer, and would be free from disease germs, instead of, as now, often contaminated—and how could it be otherwise under the present system of close byres and forced milking? It is indeed even believable that under healthier conditions and with proper feeding,¹ the milk-giving power would increase.² A friend of the present writer has been experi-

¹ Farmers are, in many cases, ignorant of the best feeding stuffs both for their own pockets and the general health and condition of the cattle.

² I wrote the above from a theoretical standpoint, and since then I have received a reprint of a paper, read by Mr. John Speir, Newton Farm, Glasgow, before the Conference on the Prevention of Tuberculosis, held in Glasgow, 1900, which goes far to show that in practice it does well. Mr. Speir says: "It has usually been con-

menting on these lines. He always has the windows in his byres open, and during the winter before last made it a practice to have all the cows out in the open most days for an hour or two. And the results in the general health of the cattle, the way in which they relished their food, and the quantity of milk they gave, fully repaid him for this extra care. He did not, however, have faith altogether. During the very worst weather of the winter the cows were not taken out, sometimes being in the byre two or three days at a stretch, and he noticed at such times a decided falling off in the quantity of the milk. He has now made up his mind to have the cows out for their constitutional every day the sun rises, no matter

considered that cows milk best when kept in a building the air of which has a temperature of from 58° to 62° Fahr. In order to have pure milk free from contamination we must have healthy cows in healthy surroundings. Cows living in badly-polluted air cannot be said to be living in healthy surroundings, neither are they likely to remain healthy for any great length of time. The question is, how can this pollution of air be avoided? The reply, I presume, can only be by the admission of fresh air. If fresh air is admitted in sufficient quantity to reduce the pollution to moderate proportions (for we can never hope to have it equal to outside air), under ordinary conditions of weather in winter, the temperature of the byre will fall to from 45° Fahr. to 55° Fahr. The average milk producer considers such a temperature would so lower the yield of his cows that his business would become unprofitable, and his opinion must be given some consideration and cannot be lightly thrown aside.

"At this point the question resolves itself into two parts: First, is it necessary to keep cows at 60° Fahr. to produce milk profitably; and second, if not, what conditions are necessary to insure success? To keep cows in a comparatively pure atmosphere at 60° Fahr. during cold weather seems to me to have no alternative but to heat the air. In one instance this has been done near Glasgow, but I very much question if by any means hitherto suggested the gain will be commensurate with the expenditure. Heating byres artificially may, therefore, for the present be dismissed as unprofitable.

"Personally, I do not consider that it is necessary for the profitable production of milk in winter in this climate that cows must be kept at or over 60° Fahr. It is well known that animals kept under cool or cold conditions gradually develop a covering of hair, which in great part protects them against sudden changes of weather. Cattle of all kinds in early autumn begin to assume a coat, which gradually becomes longer and closer as the weather gets colder. Animals so protected are quite comfortable in temperatures far below 60° Fahr., and if shut up in a byre at that temperature, they perspire so freely that their coats become quite wet. If kept warm such animals speedily shed their hair, because Nature feels it is no longer necessary, and is only a burden to the animals.

"In byres which are freely ventilated in early autumn, the temperature will be kept moderately low, the stock will, in consequence, gradually assume a longer and more compact coat than they had in summer. This coat is what is so much desired by showyard judges, consequently most animals taking prizes at the shows presently being held, have been kept in cool buildings. With such animals milk can be profitably produced in winter in freely ventilated byres, which during the cold time of the year will have a temperature of from 45° to 50° Fahr. Neither will the milk shrink to any appreciable extent when very cold snaps come on, lowering it to 40° or even 35° Fahr., as is so notoriously the case with cows kept in close, warm byres. When turned out in spring, such animals do much better than thin-haired ones, and as warm weather comes on they gradually shed their hair. The present method of keeping cows in milk in winter is an inversion of Nature's method, as, housed as they are now, they have their lightest coats in winter, and, of course, suffer severely if exposed to anything like adverse conditions of weather.

"During the past winter a friend and I, each having stocks of from sixty to seventy cows in milk, have given the system of keeping on the winter hair a fair trial, and, after recently comparing notes, we are both satisfied the method is on the proper lines. Both of us have had a very satisfactory production of milk during a winter which has not been above the average in temperature. In both cases the byres have been freely ventilated, the temperature being seldom at or over 50° Fahr., yet weeds or chills have been below the average, while no extra precautions were taken other than to sheet all cows for several days after calving."

what the weather may be like; and last winter he did this with good results. Such treatment is no more than merciful, and should always be carried out even if it had none of the decided advantages which it has.

I will quote part of a letter, bearing on this point, written by a correspondent to *The Northern Whig*, of December 4, 1900. The writer says:

"I was for some part of my life a resident in the country, and an experienced gentleman, who had lived his long life of over ninety years on his own extensive farm, presented us with cows of his own rearing, a celebrated breed of great repute, but the condition of his gift was 'the cow was to have walking exercise for an hour every day from November till May.' 'It will be troublesome,' my dear old friend said, 'but will repay the cost. The cow will always be healthy, she will give perfectly pure milk; and when she has done milking she will be a healthy animal still. The system of shutting up cows in winter is cruel and extravagant; the milk of such cows is unwholesome, and may be injurious. I have kept many cows for seventy-five years of my life. I never had any of them shut up constantly; they always were walked about every day of winter, wet or dry. You must do the same to have healthy cows and health-giving milk.' I should add that I acted on my old friend's advice for ten years, and when foot-and-mouth and other diseases were prevalent my cows never had any ailment whatever."

Not only will dairy cattle improve in health and form when properly attended to, but cattle of all kinds will also well repay the trouble of ensuring to them proper conditions of life. A relative of the writer bought lately in Dublin ten young cattle—rising three—to stall feed during the winter, from the beginning of November to the middle of February. During all the time they were in the house four large windows were kept open, while there was a foot of ventilation space at the top of each of the two doors besides other means of ventilation, so that the byre was all the time cool and supplied with pure air, and the cattle, some of which were coughing to begin with, but soon got rid of their coughs, all thrived splendidly. When ready they were taken to Belfast to a public sale. As they entered the ring there was a general chorus of admiration at their appearance from the surrounding buyers—among the best judges of cattle in the world. Many questions were asked as to how the cattle had such beautiful coats, and as to how the hair had been kept on them; and, moreover, they brought better prices by live weight than any of the 300 other fat cattle sold that day. The keeping of cattle in close warm houses is indeed an extravagance, for in this way a great deal of the efficacy of the food is wasted. It just means that a certain amount—and a large amount it is—of the food that the cattle take is thus sweated out of them again; whereas when they are kept cool—and the cooler the better, of course in reason—every ounce of nourishment possible is retained in order that the system may be fortified, and because it is not necessary to give it off again

to the same extent in the form of perspiration to keep the body at a normal temperature. Nature always compensates in these matters, and the cooler an animal organism is kept, the stronger, more robust, and better-conditioned will the body become, provided, of course, that the supply of food is sufficient. It can readily be seen that this conservation of food material, covering months of time and numbers of cattle, must be a great gain to the stock-owner. The ignorance among owners of animals—cows, horses, &c.—as to the best way in which to keep them healthy is unbelievable. An odd one of them here and there will be found to have a glimmering of the truth. A well-known local horse-breeder here, who at the time was in rather poor health, had a number of colts in the open. When winter came on he was advised by another farmer to take them indoors. His reply was: "They can just run there. When I bring in horses they always turn ill on my hands. I am sick myself and I don't want to be bothered with sick horses." They were allowed to run in fields all the winter, and of course thrived well. The owner of a merry-go-round used to visit the villages round this district. He usually had six or seven horses with him to draw the engine and other paraphernalia. As soon as he arrived at his destination the horses were unloosed and turned into some rented field. These animals were never under cover all the year round except when their owner was holding his show in Belfast or other large town, when they would be in stables, perhaps for a whole month at a stretch. This man used to say, "My horses are all right when I am in the country, and I don't know how it is, but when I go to Belfast I am sure to lose one or two of them." With the knowledge that glanders, farcy, influenza, and nearly all the illnesses to which horses are subject, are of microbic origin, and are therefore communicated from the surroundings, and that these diseases are warded off or contracted by the animals according to whether they are in a good or bad state of health, which in turn depends upon the conditions under which they are living, it would not be hard to explain to him this mystery. A good judge of horses, who told me of this instance, said that he watched with amazement these horses that lived in the open move with undistended nostrils and with the greatest ease loads that would have completely winded any other horses. Given to begin with a healthy cow or a healthy horse, there is no reason under the sun why it should not remain healthy as long as it lives. Any one interested in this matter will find in "The Open Window" in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for February, an explanation of some of the laws governing health; and the laws which govern health in man govern it equally in beast.

A young farmer told me that he once bought a farcied horse in poor condition and unfit for work for £1 to see what effect turning it out and feeding it well would have. He turned it

into the fields in the beginning of winter, kept it there night and day, and fed to it as much oats and other extra food as it would eat. After two months all external signs of farcy had disappeared and the horse was in good heart and condition, and was able for the rest of the winter to take 22 cwt. of straw three days every week to Belfast market—a distance of nineteen miles from the farmer's home. He told me that his father had said to him when he put the horse out that he would kill it, and had remarked afterwards that if it had been a good horse it would have died. The reason that valuable horses are proverbially prone to illness and accident is, that they are cared for and kept indoors more from fear of chills and other ailments than are horses of less-value, and the opposite reason accounts for donkeys being so healthy and hardy; they are worth little and are turned out to graze in all weathers and are stabled usually in an open shed, or in any odd draughty corner out of the way.

It is the general rule for cows and other cattle to be put into the byre early in November, never to be allowed out again until the beginning of May. How could any living, breathing, metabolic animal remain healthy thus? And in what dark, unventilated, foul-smelling, suffocating byres they are usually kept!¹ Any one unacquainted with farm life can have no idea of the imperative necessity for radical changes in these matters, and for strict supervision; no idea of the state of the average byre—of the filth of the cow's udder, the milker's hands and clothes, and of the byre itself; no idea of the kind of water many cattle have to drink (when they have any), no idea of the insanitary state of the milk vessels, and no idea of the looseness in the methods employed. I know a farm at which the cows are milked and the butter made by two women, one of whom is in consumption while the other has swollen tubercular glands. Did the public but see a tithe of what goes on in the places that produce three of the most important articles of their food—milk, butter, and beef—there would be no longer any need

¹ The Medical Officer of Health of an important district in the North of England recently reported upon his inspection of byres. Out of sixty-eight buildings which he inspected there were only half-a-dozen in which even the most rudimentary attempt had been made to admit light or air. No light! No fresh air! Even if there happen to be a window in a byre it is seldom made to open, and if there be air inlets they are usually stopped up with straw. In most byres there is not even room for the cattle to stand in comfort, never to speak of lie down in comfort. A few months ago I went to see a building in the corner of a grass plot in the very heart of one of the most fashionable suburbs of Belfast. The dimensions of this house were: length 10ft., breadth 6½ft., height 5½ft, and it had no window and no opening of any kind save the door, which was shut. In it were kept two cows and sometimes a calf also. How could cattle confined in such a place for six long, long months without a single break possibly remain healthy? It is a terrible thought this, that man, from ignorance or perversity, is needlessly engendering disease in animals; and, through them, in his fellow man. Natural laws are inexorable, and cannot with impunity be disregarded. Through countless ages, and by long processes of evolution, organisms have been adapting themselves to surrounding natural conditions, and it is impossible that these conditions can be arbitrarily altered without the most disastrous results.

for such an advocacy as mine for reform; and Lord Salisbury, if he but knew the truth, would no longer say that this is not a matter for the attention of the Government. There are, of course, some honourable exceptions to this sweeping charge, but the fact that we are being out-distanced and out-classed as butter-makers by countries which have nothing like such good natural facilities as we have, but where there is supervision, and where the dairy work is scientifically conducted, is alone sufficient to show that there is need for reform.

Having separated out such as were diseased, we have now a herd of sound animals in our sanitary, well-ventilated, not overcrowded byre, and there is no reason why they should not keep sound if properly fed, watered, and cared for, and the byre kept clean, sweet, and well ventilated; and it may be here said that high ceilings and large cubic space are of little avail without free ventilation, as they only postpone for an hour or two all the ill-effects of smaller unventilated houses. We would thus have well-nourished cattle living under good conditions, and they would then be in a fit condition to resist the disease, even in the unlikely event of their coming in contact with it. Indeed it is probable that if any of the animals in such a herd had undeveloped tubercle germs in their systems they would, under these improved conditions, be able to get rid of them and to remain unaffected.

In an article on Consumption in the *Nineteenth Century Review* for October 1899, occurred the following passage, which I may be pardoned for repeating here:

“That tuberculosis in cattle is a matter for compulsory measures—for State interference and supervision—would not be hard to prove. At a meeting held at Belfast, on April 4, for the purpose of establishing a branch of the *National Society for the Prevention of Consumption*, mention was made of a farmer who had some cows that were in a very advanced stage of tuberculosis, but who would not sell them, for purposes of investigation, because they ate so little and gave so much milk! What will avail with such a man? Nothing short of compulsion. He will never move of his own free will.¹ The periodical examination of all herds, the strict and complete separation of unsound from sound cattle (the unsound being got rid of as expeditiously as possible, it being allowable only to sell them for slaughter), the competent inspection of all byres in order to ensure adequate ventilation and to prevent overcrowding, would soon clear our herds of tuberculosis. The table given by Sir Herbert Maxwell in his article ‘Tuberculosis in Man and Beast’ in this *Review* for October 1898, dealing with the five years’ result of a system of partially separating in Denmark the unsound from the

¹ Many instances could be cited to show that, as a rule, the farmer or dairyman, if he can save himself from loss and trouble or make a profit, cares nothing absolutely for the havoc he may work on the health of his neighbours.

sound animals—both being under one roof and kept apart only by a movable partition—gives one reason to hope, that with complete separation, and under improved conditions of life—good food, well-lighted, well-ventilated, clean byres, no overcrowding and a reasonable outing for the cattle in the open every day—no fresh cases of tuberculosis would develop among the sound animals. The table referred to shows that, even under the unfavourable condition mentioned, sometimes only as few as 1 out of 127, 2 out of 122, and 2 out of 132 animals in the sound section reacted at the end of six months.”¹

It would be necessary to have strict supervision of all dairy farms, and of all other places where cattle were kept, in order to ensure the proper carrying out of the necessary measures, until such time as tuberculosis had completely disappeared. At the same time there would need to be testings of all animals, say every three or six months, in order to remove such as had become affected. For this purpose local veterinary surgeons would be available, supervised by Government district veterinary surgeons appointed solely for this work. There would be found at these testings to be very few reacting animals, and such would at once be removed and placed with the others that were diseased.

This brings us back to the animals which reacted when the tuberculin test was applied, and which were separated out from their sound neighbours; it is the only difficult part of the whole problem, for if these presently diseased animals could be got rid of, and if we could start clear with none but sound cattle, it would be a comparatively easy matter to so order things that tuberculosis in cattle would practically cease to exist. Perhaps if we were wise we would slaughter every one of these tuberculous cattle out of hand, use as much of them as we could with safety, bear the loss of the remainder, and be done with them.² But we are not wise enough to do that.

¹ This table deals with cattle that were so badly treated as to be kept indoors for as long sometimes as six months without a break, and is as follows:

	Reacting section.	Sound section.	AT RISK OF BECOMING A sound section.
April 1892 . . .	131	77	—
October 1892 . . .	—	77	7
May 1893 . . .	90	103	10
October 1893 . . .	—	107	1
April 1894 . . .	81	122	2
October 1894 . . .	—	119	1 (?)
May 1895 . . .	69	136	2 + 1 (?)
October 1895 . . .	—	132	2
April 1896 . . .	54	149	7
October 1896 . . .	48	147	7 + 2 (?)
May 1897 . . .	49	155	6

² Virchow, who has done more than any other scientist to stamp out in animals diseases dangerous to man, in a speech delivered at the Berlin Congress, said: “I will not deny that I do not entirely concur in what has been mooted here with reference to another point. Radical help would only be found by killing all such (tuberculous) animals; that, in my opinion, is the only way to bring about any permanent improvement. All others are only palliative measures.” After speaking

What then can we do? We can see to it that all owners of tuberculous cattle separate them from the sound animals, put them into the fields and keep them there continuously, feeding them well and never bringing them indoors at all even at night or in winter. From such braving of the elements the cattle would not suffer; not one per cent. of them would die from exposure. An open shed in the field would only be needed for their shelter in excessively bad weather. With good feeding, and this constant life in the open, it is not too much to believe that at the end of six months many of these animals, when tested, would be found free from tuberculosis. The extra condition of the cattle after six months of such life would more than compensate, in most cases, for the trouble. Such as reacted after a fair chance in this way would be slaughtered and used as thought best, and the owner compensated by the State. It would of course be necessary to exercise a considerable amount of discretion as to whether an animal would be worth taking any trouble with. All such as were found to be diseased in the udder, and those that were badly affected otherwise—although the tuberculin test cannot indicate the extent of the disease, yet an experienced man can fairly well pick out bad cases from watching how the cattle feed, from general appearance, and from many external signs—would be slaughtered, and, if advisable, used as far as possible, the farmers receiving compensation. Cattle when found to be affected would be marked in such a way as to be readily known as diseased; and it would not be permissible to sell them for any purpose but for slaughter, or, in the case of cows, to use their milk until such times as they were declared free from tuberculosis.

By these means not only would the disease be prevented from spreading to the sound animals, but also many diseased cattle would be saved; for, although it has not yet been tried whether cattle can be cured of tuberculosis, yet the analogy in this disease between man and animal is so close, that what holds good in the one case, must hold good in the other also; it will, therefore, be found that tuberculosis in cattle is curable.¹ Even if diseased animals could

of the successful war he had waged against trichina, in which, to make headway, it was found necessary not only to slaughter all affected animals, but also to destroy the flesh of all such, he went on to say: "Similar measures will have to be adopted with the so-called tuberculosis of cattle if we really mean to push the thing through. I have no scruple in saying now that, the more I have occupied myself with it, the more I am convinced that we can find no other help."

¹ Since writing the above my attention has been drawn to an article, "Tuberculosis and Milk," by Sir Edmund Verney, in the *New Century Review* of March 1900, the following passage in which bears on this point:

"It is possible, however, that another method of exterminating tuberculosis in cattle may prove effective; it may be that the open-air treatment of consumption will prove as efficacious with animals as it has proved with men. The experiments of the Cheshire County Council point in this direction. In Professor Wörtley Axe's paper, to which allusion has already been made, he gives the result of the tuberculin test as applied to nine different herds; in two of the nine the cows were made to lead a purely outdoor life, day and night, summer and winter, and in these two herds—one, consisting of forty-one cows and the other of seventeen—every animal was

not be quite freed from tuberculosis, nothing better could happen in their own interest and the interest of the sound cattle than that they should be put into the fields and kept there. The expense upon the State of getting rid of all diseased animals, either by slaughtering or treating them, would not be intolerable. In two or three years most of the animals at present diseased would in these ways be accounted for, and as there would be but few fresh cases of tuberculosis—and these would be getting fewer year by year—after the cause of infection had been removed, and the animals allowed to live under good conditions, we would soon have such mastery over the disease as would render it no longer a terror to us, and soon thereafter it would entirely disappear.

This then, broadly, is the mode of procedure: Separate the unsound from the sound animals; get rid of the unsound cattle as quickly as convenient, either by slaughtering or treating them; keep the sound animals under proper conditions, and they will remain sound. Thus an end would be put to this troublesome matter, and at a cost light in comparison to the good that would result.

It is sometimes said that farmers have been hardly dealt with, in that Free Trade, which has been such a boon to the community at large, has almost ruined their calling. Here is a way in which the general community can repay agriculturists and stock-owners in some degree. Let the expense of freeing our herds from tuberculosis be borne by the nation in the interests of the farmers, and in the interests of the nation itself. Any one can see that all the money spent in such a cause would be returned many times over in a few years, if we take into account the numbers of cattle that would thereby be saved. But besides, there are the thousands of human lives that would be spared yearly; this alone would surely be justification for our spending considerably, even if such spending were commercially unsound.

Perhaps one-third of the cattle in this country are affected with tuberculosis, and the proportion is increasing. Of these affected animals the vast majority are cows, and it is certain there are many byres the cows in which would all be found to be tuberculous. Are we to go on allowing these animals to infect others, and they in turn others still, *ad infinitum*, when all that is necessary to change this is the expenditure of some energy and money? Are we to stand inactive, lest we should trample on the supposed liberties of a few? What of the liberties of the many? Recently I saw at the

found to be healthy. A herd of thirty-eight cows confined in a shed day and night, every one of which looked the picture of health, proved to be over 30 per cent. tuberculous. The owner could not believe this result to be correct, and had two of his best animals slaughtered; in both instances the lungs and their adjacent lymph-glands were found to be in parts crowded with tubercles in all phases of growth and degeneration."

Edinburgh abattoirs a carcass the lungs and certain glands of which were masses of corruption from tuberculosis. The cow had been killed but half-an-hour before, and the probability was that the milk from that cow had been sold the previous day. It is interesting and instructive to note that in Edinburgh, where every diseased carcass, however slightly affected, is condemned, the number of tuberculous cattle received for slaughter has dribbled down to a minimum, owners taking them to neighbouring towns where the regulations are not so stringent.

If measures such as are here indicated cannot be adopted in full, Government should, at least, make it compulsory for all affected animals to be marked, separated, and kept apart from those that are sound; and should permit such tuberculous cattle to be sold only for slaughter. This in itself would be a long step in advance, and would result in a marked decrease of fresh cases; it would also tend to the extermination of affected animals, as their saleability would be impaired, and the having them on the premises undesirable for the stock-owner.

JAMES ARTHUR GIBSON.

DEPRESSION: THE DISEASE OF THE TIME.

It is generally admitted that the disease of mental depression is a very common one at the present time, especially with what are usually called the *educated* classes. It is proposed in the present article to discuss the causes of this malady and, if possible, to suggest a remedy.

No doubt in all ages there have been many people who suffered from depression from various causes, more or less personal to themselves; but the wide extent of the disease in modern times seems to suggest that there must be some general cause or causes of the phenomenon. Mr. Albert Chevalier's well-known song, "Wot's the good of anyfin? Vy, nuffin!" expresses a really not uncommon state of mind, and its popularity is probably due to its striking a sympathetic chord in the breast of the hearers.

What, then, is lacking to this generation, the want of which causes this peculiar feeling of depression? Is it physical energy, or moral principle, or will-power, or religious faith? Some or all of these are probably more or less deficient. We have been told so by various prophets, notably by Carlyle and Emerson, whose main object was to put some kind of faith and energy into their fellow-men; and it must be admitted that, in individual cases at any rate, they have succeeded. A better tonic for the mind than *Sartor Resartus*, or Emerson's Essay on *Self-Reliance*, could hardly be imagined, and many distinguished men have borne eloquent testimony to the bracing effects of those two great writers.

While, however, the lack of all the qualities named may be more or less responsible for the depression which we have to consider, the great desideratum, in the opinion of the present writer, is physical energy directed by active intellectual power. Physical energy itself is by no means deficient, but it is frequently divorced from intellect; and even where it is accompanied by mental ability, this latter is frequently paralysed by the collapse of religious faith and the consequent confusion of ethical standards.

The moral and intellectual confusion is naturally most keenly felt by the finest minds. People who live by rule of thumb, or by accepting the conventional ideas of their neighbours, and who never

think things out for themselves, are hardly aware of the extent of the collapse of the traditional creed. It is only the intellectual people who are troubled.

Without going into theological questions, few competent authorities will be disposed to deny that a great deal of Christian theology, which was once firmly believed in and made the basis of Christian ethics, is now no longer tenable. The dropping of a few theological articles would perhaps matter little if we could be sure where we would stop, and if it could be shown that the overthrow of the theological structure of Christianity would not effect its moral authority. That, however, is just what cannot be shown. The ethical authority of a religion can hardly survive the theology which constitutes to so great an extent the religion itself—which is, at any rate, the skeleton or framework upon which the religion is built. The Christian religion cannot afford to be brought down to the level of that of Confucius, which is simply a collection of moral apothegms, without any ultimate authority beyond their inherent merits.

The authority of Christian ethics must necessarily stand or fall with the truth of Christian theology. The most logical minds cannot help seeing this and appreciating the consequent chaos in ethics. *Hinc illa lachrymæ.*

The real moving force in the world of to-day is *Science*. While it is not meant to be implied that religion is no longer believed in, it is certainly not held with the unwavering faith of the Middle Ages, nor even with the somewhat less settled faith of the Puritans. While in the Middle Ages everybody believed in religion and knew little or nothing of science, to-day everybody believes in science, simply because he cannot help it, and only the second place is left for religion in the intellectual microcosm.

While science has thus largely displaced religion and shaken the authority which Christian ethics formerly exercised over us, she has not so far succeeded in furnishing us with a satisfactory system of moral philosophy to take the place of supernatural ethics. Various attempts in this direction have been made, but no signal success has yet been achieved. At all events, no scientific ethical system has yet succeeded in commanding any great degree of popularity even among the best educated classes.

It has almost become a commonplace to say that we are in an age of transition. The present age bears a considerable resemblance to the declining days of Paganism, when the philosophers were undermining the old religion with their criticism and the new religion was struggling into life. While Christianity is not perhaps being destroyed as Paganism was destroyed, it is undoubtedly going through a very critical evolutionary phase, and it seems inevitable that it will issue from the ordeal a very different kind of religion from what it was, say, a century ago.

Such ages of transition are frequently periods of melancholy. Men's minds are unsettled, and there is a general spirit of uneasiness abroad. When the Roman Empire was under the government of the Antonines, although the period was one of great material prosperity (just like our own Victorian epoch in that respect), it was yet tinged with a kind of intellectual sadness. A beautiful picture of the dying Pagan world has been given to us by that wonderfully delicate writer, Walter Pater, in his *Marius; the Epicurean*.

It is in such times that intellectual men are led to search for the foundations of moral principles. If an ordinary man is asked why any particular act is wrong, he will perhaps reply that he *feels* and *knows* it is wrong, and that that is enough for him. An intellectual man, however, even if his feeling corresponds with that of the ordinary man (which may very likely not be the case), will yet ask himself *why* he feels in that particular manner, and further, what validity can his or other people's feelings have in settling moral questions. He will bear in mind that different people feel very differently about ethical questions; how, then, can the feelings be a sufficient guide for settling what is right and what is wrong? He will see the necessity of probing the matter more deeply in order to put morals in an authoritative position; and, failing to find a rational basis for them, it is possible that he may conceive himself at liberty to discard them altogether. At any rate, his capacity for resisting temptation is bound to be weakened.

Thus in such ages there is a want of a definite moral standard and of moral restraints. People are inclined to ask themselves, "Is there really any reason why we should not do as we choose?" They may come to think of virtue as Marcus Brutus is said to have spoken of it in his dying moments: "O virtue, I have ever followed thee, and find thee at last but an empty name!" Yet, when those who are capable of better things discard virtue, they find little pleasure in self-indulgence.

What we want is greater simplicity and more freedom in discussing vital questions. A great deal of the pessimism of which we hear so much to-day is bred by the impatience which thinking men cannot help feeling at the shallow optimism of popular authors. In our opinion the proper attitude of mind is neither pessimism nor optimism, but what may be described as meliorism; that is to say, the view that, although the world is doubtless bad enough, it is quite capable of being mended, and that it rests mainly with ourselves to make it a very happy place indeed. What we suffer from nature is, after all, very small in comparison with what we suffer from one another. It is true that a hurricane, an earthquake, or a shipwreck may cause serious and undeserved loss of life. True that disease may assail us, and that death is bound to be our portion sooner or later. These things have to be borne, and would be far

more tolerable if we had nothing to suffer from one another.
But

“Man’s inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn.”

The depressed mind seeks for sympathy, and that is not always to be obtained. For sympathy we usually look to the fair sex; but it must be confessed that women have little understanding, and consequently but little sympathy for intellectual troubles, for there can be no true sympathy without understanding. Men can understand one another better than women can understand them; but it is not everybody who has the happiness to possess an intimate friend of his own sex to whom he feels at liberty to pour out his whole heart. If you talk of depression and intellectual troubles, most men, even if they have experienced similar feelings themselves, will half suspect you of shamming, of posing, or of seeking to advertise yourself. It is seldom, indeed, nowadays that sensitive souls can meet with kindred spirits, in sweet communion with whom they may safely unburden themselves, without any fear of being misunderstood or of exposing themselves to ridicule. We have travelled a long way from the days of Orestes and Pylades, of Damon and Pythias, or even of Shakespeare and Michael Angelo. Where to-day could we find even a friendship like that of Alfred Tennyson and Arthur Hallam? Who would now devote ten years of his life to erecting such a monument as *In Memoriam*, “more lasting than brass,” to the memory of a dead friend?

The friendship and sympathy of our fellows are the best remedies for depression of spirits. By sympathy we do not mean uttering conventional words of consolation in time of trouble. We mean endeavouring to put yourself in another man’s place, and to see things from his point of view.

The famous Jean Jacques Rousseau, though not a strong moral character, possessed in an eminent degree the virtue of a broad human sympathy. It was, indeed, probably the consciousness of his own weaknesses that made him so sympathetic towards others. An anecdote is related of him which places this virtue of his in a strong light. On one occasion he had composed an opera, which was performed before the king, Louis XV., and met with the royal approval. The king sent for him, and if he had put in an appearance he would probably have obtained a pension. He was, however, of a retiring disposition, and could not bring himself to face the Court. To his friends he gave as a reason his Republican opinions, but his real reason was his shyness. Accordingly he fled from the Court and sought the privacy of a country inn. While he was there a man came in, who began telling the company that he was the celebrated Rousseau, and proceeded to give an account of the opera, which he said had been performed before the king with great success. Most

men in Rousseau's position would have felt nothing but contempt for the impostor, but this extraordinary man felt only pity and shame: "I trembled and blushed so," he tells us in his *Confessions*, "for fear the man should be found out, that it might have been thought that I was the impostor." He was afraid that somebody might come in who knew him and expose the pretender. At last he could bear it no longer and slipped out unobserved. Very few people would treat an impostor like that.

No doubt there is a great deal of morbid feeling in the minds of many young men and maidens in this "decadent" period; and the tendency in England is to stifle as much as possible the expression of such feelings. We wish to hide the disease, and then pretend that it is not there. Expression is, however, in itself a natural and healthy relief for the feelings; while morbidity of thought, if suppressed, becomes inveterate and intensified. The mind recoils upon itself and seeks to indemnify itself for the lack of open expression by the audacity of its self-communings. As our greatest poet has it:

"An oven that is stopped, or river stayed,
Burneth more hotly, swolleth with more rage.
So of concealed sorrow may be said;
Free vent of words love's sorrow doth assuage;
But when the heart's attorney¹ once is mate,
The client breaks, as desperate in his suit."

When a human heart does venture to utter a cry in this age, the critics find fault. The offender, if a man, is lacking in virility, he should have shown more self-restraint; if a woman, she is said to have broken through the reserve natural to her sex. The frank confessions of *An Englishwoman's Love Letters*, for instance, have been stigmatised as unwomanly. In order to be a polite and irreproachable member of society, it is necessary to stifle natural human feelings; or, as Mr. W. S. Gilbert expresses it, "to shun all unrehearsed emotions."

To set things on a firm foundation again, we want full, free, and unlimited discussion. A recent writer has ventured to prophesy that what will seem to posterity to have been the most characteristic feature of the nineteenth century is its curious intellectual cowardice. Men are brave enough physically, but they are terribly afraid of new ideas. What hinders us but cowardice from setting resolutely to work to sound everything to the bottom, and making up our minds to drop all conceptions out of the furniture of our minds that are no longer logically tenable? Thus only can we hope to lay the foundations of a firm faith for the future. Let us "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." If we cannot believe in the traditions of the past, let us find something in which we can believe.

¹ *I.e.*, the tongue.

This will be the task for the twentieth century—to find a faith credible to enlightened men, and also to apply to the improvement of human society, and the removal of morbid conditions of life, the immense acquisitions in scientific knowledge which have been made for us by the master-minds of the century just closed.

WALTER J. BAYLIS, M.A.

CRIMINAL REFORM.

THE virus of a very serious social evil has lately reached this country. It first appeared in America, and it has now become endemic at Elmira in the State of Massachusetts, where a large prison has been fitted up with expensive machinery, and all the apparatus necessary to carry out the new pathological process.

The etiology of this morbid condition assumes that all crime is due not so much to the depravity as to the delicate health of the criminal, and should be treated medically, followed by a course of Turkish baths and athletic exercises. Punitive treatment of any kind is said to aggravate the disease, and should be avoided, while the patient is kept in a cheerful frame of mind by a liberal and varied diet, the soothing effect of tobacco and light literature, including the daily and weekly newspapers, while his mind is cultivated by amusing and instructive lectures, music, and the drama. The patients are encouraged to learn to perform on some musical instrument, and the pandemonium which results during the hours devoted to practice is said, by a recent visitor, to conduce to quietness when it ceases.

The security of life and property is seriously endangered by this sentimental treatment of hardened criminals.

In some of the States the action of the Criminal Courts is so corrupt and unsatisfactory, and the sentences inflicted so little punitive, that lynch law is frequently put in force, and men are compelled habitually to carry arms to protect themselves. This is the case not only in the border States but in large centres of civilisation, like New Orleans, where a number of Italians were lynched a few years ago, and the papers have lately reported several cases where negroes have been burnt alive by those who profess and call themselves Christians.

But an evil of still greater magnitude is created when State funds are employed to establish factories, the produce of which is sold in competition with that of free labour at a profit, in one prison, of £56,000 per annum, and the demoralising example is set before the poor of a convict placed in a far better position as to food, clothing, lodging, and the pleasures of life than the honest man with whom he competes in the labour market.

Mr. Holmes, the well-known philanthropist and police court mis-

sionary, is profoundly dissatisfied with the reformatory effect of prison discipline in England, and in a book entitled *Pictures and Problems from the London Police Courts*, and an article in the *Contemporary Review*, advocates the American system, though his own experience in working it does not appear to have been very encouraging. He writes :

" Briefly, then, I would suggest short sentences, abolition of ticket-of-leave, interesting work, and more of it ; less time alone and more with the schoolmaster ; gradual improvement in conditions as a reward for industry and good behaviour ; some relaxation at intervals such as lectures with the magic-lantern, concerts, &c., &c. I would go much further, for I would have lecturers, who can speak well and interestingly upon various subjects, invited to speak to the prisoners ; I would have good singers and first-class musicians invited occasionally to give the prisoners a concert ; I would have the prisons supplied plentifully with books, and constant additions made to the library.

" I would have a looking-glass in every cell, that prisoners might at any time take knowledge of themselves.

" I would have every warder master of a trade or able to teach something useful."

In reply to an inquiry as to the kind of work he would suggest, he says : " Any kind of interesting work for which a market could be found," and he disposes of the objection that prison labour competes with free labour in the market with the remark that it is a " stupid cry," and justifies the competition by pointing to the Church Army, which also competes with free labour.

If this philanthropic reformer had paid a visit to the Wormwood Scrubbs Prison he would have seen that, though the Gnothi Seauton is not yet inculcated by the use of a mirror, some of the more practical of his suggestions have long since been anticipated. During the first month of imprisonment the convict is allowed only religious and instructive books, but subsequently he is well supplied with amusing and interesting literature. Mr. Holmes attaches great importance to the cut of the clothes, and the coiffure, of a convict when discharged from the prison ; there is, he knows, a " redeeming influence, especially to a man of taste, in a clean well-fitted shirt," and he adds, that he has known some men find positive salvation in a well-made, nicely-fitting suit of clothes. This idea is not original ; he appears to have derived it from a French lady, who exclaimed : " What are all the consolations of religion compared to the satisfaction of feeling that you are nicely dressed ? "

The police court missionary considers that the unfashionable cut of the prison-made clothes has a demoralising effect. He will rejoice to hear that convicts are not necessarily dressed in prison-made clothes when released, nor is their hair cut so short as to make them conspicuous ; he has fallen into a very common error, which originated, perhaps, in a practice long since obsolete. The convict, when released, is entitled to a clothing allowance of £1 17s. 2d.,

and, if he prefers it, can purchase clothing from the stores of the Royal Prisoners' Aid Society, which is excellent in quality and make and far cheaper than any he could obtain in the open market.

Mr. Holmes will be surprised to hear that convicts are carefully instructed in several handicrafts while in prison, and those who are already skilled workmen are allowed to work at their trade, care being taken that they shall compete as little as possible with free labour, by employing them on work that is required by the Government departments only.

Convicts are carefully classified according to age, previous convictions, and to criminality, and encouraged to industry and good conduct by a reduction of the period of imprisonment; they can also earn a maximum of £6, which is placed at their disposal on discharge through the medium of a Prisoners' Aid Society.

It is singular that a missionary who is so familiar with prison life should never have heard of these indulgences. He remarks :

"All crime does not proceed from wickedness, nor from the love of wrong-doing. This I have learned, and would to God I could burn this truth into the brain and conscience of the nation; we should then seek to understand our criminals, and, getting some knowledge of them, we should deal differently with them."

It would be impossible, with the space at our disposal, to follow Mr. Holmes through the whole of his extraordinary ideas, but his method of dealing with habitual convicts may be gathered from his treatment of a man he describes as a "burglar friend," who was "exact, methodical, industrious beyond measure, honest in all his dealings; who was to him a friend, a study, and a delight"; but unfortunately he had one foible—an irresistible passion for burglary, only burglary, accompanied by violence. This was his one weakness, but it had embittered his otherwise blameless life.

It had established such a fascination over his mind that, though only forty years of age, he had passed more than twenty-five years of his "exact and industrious" life in prison. On his last discharge, after fifteen years imprisonment, he was taken under Mr. Holmes' benevolent care. He tells us "this man wants a stake in society, something to lose," and he at once provided that stake by establishing him in a comfortable house, with all necessary furniture and appliances to carry on his trade as a bookbinder.

Here he lived happily with his wife for two years; but, as his benefactor truly observes: "Nothing but the Divine inspiration, that comes from human goodness, can, or ever will, help such men"; and the result was that he threw away the stake in society that had been so kindly provided for him, and committed another burglary, with or without murder is not stated, but we are specially informed, as an extenuating circumstance, that he had £5 of his own money in his pocket at the time he committed the robbery.

He was arrested, and sentenced to three years imprisonment, and his ticket-of-leave was revoked—but, owing to the kind intervention of one of the magistrates, he was released by the Home Secretary before the expiration of his sentence.

The impenitent burglar returned to his benefactor, who "was struck speechless at the sight of him"; their interview must have been most affecting, for though inured to prison life, on this occasion the punishment had converted him into "a wild animal"; but having been cruelly deprived of the use of a mirror while in prison he was unaware of the change that had taken place in his features. When he saw the reflection of his face in a glass, he was so shocked that "he covered his face with his hands and cried like a child."

Humanity demands that convicts should not be exposed to such cruel privations. After all, they are our fellow-creatures, and should not be deprived of an article of toilet so indispensable as a mirror.

Mr. O'Brien was deprived of his trousers by a brutal Anglo-Saxon jailor, but never of his mirror.

The prodigal was again taken in, "lodged with some excellent people, who soon learnt to love him," and in a short time he recovered human features and learned "to smile and even to laugh." This is hardly a matter of surprise. Although twenty-six years of prison discipline had failed to reform the convict, it had at least taught him to control his features and to refrain from immoderate laughter under the most ludicrous circumstances. Capital was once more provided to set him up in his handicraft, but the "Divine inspiration" was again denied him.

With "some pounds of his own honest earnings in his pocket" he broke into the house of a workman in the suburbs. He was arrested in the act, and was sentenced to five years penal servitude. His ticket-of-leave was again revoked, so that he will be required to serve the four years remitted from previous sentences. The lamentations of the criminal reformer on this unfortunate incident indicate a tenderness of heart which must almost disqualify him for the practical work of life. He writes of his friend:

"Shall I ever see him again? Not at liberty; nay, nay, in less than nine years he will have eaten his own heart. I see him, a man of many talents, in the monotonous daily round of his uninteresting task; I see him in the horrible and long continued solitude of his cell; I see the disappearance of the man and the resuscitation of the brute, but never again shall I see his deft fingers at work. A year or two of maddening thought, incessant reflection, and choking confinement, and he will have passed into the presence chamber of the Great Judge."

This rhapsody will have prepared the reader for the announcement that Mr. Holmes disapproves entirely of manual labour as a

means of employment for convicts. Oakum-picking is condemned as tending to cause insanity. Wood-chopping, addressing envelopes, paper-sorting under unpleasant conditions, even clerical work, and pick and shovel work in competition with the navy, are all objectionable, being "monotonous, ill-requited drudgery," and pick and shovel work is especially condemned as "not elevating." He apparently prefers the American system, supplemented by lynch law, and a miraculous intervention of the Almighty for the reform of criminals.

The great majority of convicts are only capable of manual labour. To deprive them of that is to condemn them to a life of idleness.

Mr. Holmes does not appear to be aware that fifteen years imprisonment is never imposed by the Criminal Courts for burglary unless accompanied by circumstances of great atrocity; but that is a mere detail to which he does not allude. He tells us instead that "tenderness and pity and love may dwell in the heart of the most confirmed criminal." But not one word of sympathy is expressed for the many victims of his protégé's atrocities.

His book is calculated to have a very mischievous effect. He dwells with interest on the numerous convictions of a notorious female drunkard, and repeats her vulgar jocularities before the magistrate; he not only glorifies the criminal and extenuates his crime, but he seeks to render him dissatisfied with honest labour because it is monotonous and ill-paid. He would thus place the convict in a better position than the honest poor, and foster a venomous community of ruffians who would render life and property unsafe, and create a social condition that is only to be found in less civilised communities.

It is teaching of this kind, added to the lenient sentences passed on criminals, and the comforts of prison life, that has produced the present outbreak of criminal violence, and compelled respectable people to carry arms for their own protection. The papers contain numerous instances of outrages committed with impunity in open day and in public streets; one unfortunate man, who was attacked by highwaymen on Clapham Common, having used his revolver in self-defence, was summoned by the police, but the magistrate held that he was quite justified.

The *Pall Mall Gazette*, after enumerating several crimes of violence committed in London, reports an instance in which the long-suffering tradesmen of North Kensington had lynched two men "who had wrecked a grocer's shop."

The *Times*, of February 6, 1901, reports no less than five cases of criminal violence, two of them being murder and attempt to murder. The previous convictions of the criminals in the other three cases were thirty-four, fourteen, and "several" respectively.

A verdict of manslaughter was recorded in one murder case,

which the judge declared to be "very nearly murder, and might have been treated as murder," and the convict was sentenced to twenty years penal servitude. The other case was remanded, but comfortable board and lodging, and nominal labour, was again provided for the habitual criminals.

In a recent number of the *Nineteenth Century*, Mr. Anderson very ably exposes the present ridiculous manner of dealing with habitual criminals; but the American system, as advocated by Mr. Holmes, recalls the important discoveries of Gulliver in the Island of Laputa. During my early service in India I had some experience in dealing with "thugs." They were as utterly irreclaimable as the criminals of this country, who in repeated short sentences spend half of their lives in prison; yet they were suppressed, without too much hanging, and are now almost unknown.

The same measures which have converted the thugs into an industrious community of tent-makers at Jubbulpore, would break up the gangs of burglars and receivers of stolen property in London, and if they were not reformed, they would at least be kept out of mischief, and the public protected from their depredations and violence, which is not the case at present.

Although evil communications have no doubt their well-known proverbial effect, Mr. Justice Wills and others, who have given careful consideration to the subject, consider that the habitual criminal is in a great measure the victim of heredity; and not the least important result of his more rational treatment would be to cut off the supply of criminal protoplasm in the embryo, so that the race would soon become extinct.

LIONEL ASHBURNER,

Late Police Commissioner, Northern Division, Bombay.

A PLEA FOR POSTERITY.

"THERE is a destiny made for man by his ancestors, and no one can elude the tyranny of his organisation."¹

These few words embody one of the profoundest truths connected with human existence, yet one which, to judge by results, is a matter of supreme indifference to the majority of civilised men.

Heredity is so vast a subject, evolving issues and latent possibilities so wide, that, as a science, it remains at the beginning of the present century still in its infancy, awaiting the advent of some genius to lift the veil and shed light where obscurity now prevails.

Enough is however known to enable every person of ordinary intelligence to appreciate certain principles and broad facts, which would be of enormous value to the race were they generally acknowledged and acted upon.

During the historic ages of the world man has always, in some measure, recognised the laws of heredity. In the ancient Mosaic law we read :

"The sins of the fathers shall be visited upon the children unto the third and fourth generation."

In the sacred laws of Manu we find :

"A woman always brings into the world a son gifted with the same qualities as he who begat him."

"We may know by his acts the man that belongs to a low class or who is born of a disreputable mother."

"A man of low birth has the evil disposition of his father, or of his mother, or of both—he never can hide his descent."

The same elementary ideas are understood by every class of society in the civilised world; even the most ignorant can readily grasp the fact that their offspring is, at any rate, in some measure a reproduction of themselves, whether it be in form, feature, or character. "Like father like son"; "He's a chip of the old block"; and similar sayings express sentiments which are fully appreciated by all intelligent persons; nevertheless, with these broad foundations of general knowledge to work upon, no steps are taken, no safeguards are raised, to shield the coming generations from the grave perils which threaten their well-being.

In spite of all that is known, all that has been said and written, the eminently unfit of every class propagate their kind without hindrance or protest; in fact, they are encouraged to do so, first by

¹ Maudsley.

the popular teaching of religion, which throws all responsibility on to the shoulders of a Supreme Being; and, secondly, by public institutions able and willing to relieve them of a troublesome and expensive burden.

"The Lord sends them," cries the beggar woman of her starving brood. "It's God's will," says the stricken mother of her idiot child, all unconscious of her own and her drunken partner's crime; and this same sentiment finds echo in all ranks of society, varied only by the "eat, drink, and be merry" attitude of a certain class bent on self-indulgence at all costs.

The fruits of this unconscious or wilful blindness are already being garnered and a bitter harvest is being reaped, as certain forms of disease claim to themselves an ever increasing number of victims.

Insanity and suicide (twin brothers), intemperance (chronic alcoholism), and cancer may, for example, be regarded as most potent forces for evil, affecting the mental, moral, and physical well-being of mankind.

How enormously these terrible diseases are on the increase may be seen from the following table of statistics compiled from the Registrar-General's Health Report during a period of twenty-three years:

Annual Death Rate to a Million Persons living in England.

Year.	Insanity.	Suicide.	Alcoholism.	Cancer.
1875	11	67	27	470
1876	38	73	27	470
1877	61	69	30	486
1878	73	71	31	501
1879	68	80	26	500
1880	65	77	26	511
1881	96	75	33	520
1882	90	75	38	531
1883	112	74	34	549
1884	106	76	34	563
1885	99	74	35	572
1886	86	82	38	590
1887	82	80	40	615
1888	92	82	40	621
1889	97	76	42	656
1890	93	77	51	676
1891	96	85	52	692
1892	91	88	52	690
1893	100	87	57	711
1894	101	91	49	713
1895	119	92	55	755
1896	110	86	58	764
1897	119	90	63	787
1898	114	92	65	802

These figures are beyond dispute, and the least thinking person may well pause and consider what they portend in the life history of the human race, should no check be brought to bear upon them.

Of all the afflictions to which man is subject insanity in its diverse phases is without question the saddest and the gravest, the most degrading and far reaching in its consequences.

The death of the young and beloved may draw "tears of blood" from our hearts, but the very finality and hopelessness of death have in themselves a measure of comfort, and in our hour of deepest despair we know that the great healer "Time" will gently dip us in the waters of Lethe, and that the morrow will bring with it a due measure of sunshine and happiness. But when we look on the face of an idiot child, or watch the dark clouds gather, until at last they obscure the mental vision of those we love, then, indeed, we may say, in the words of the sorely-tried man of old, the world has become "as a land of darkness, as darkness itself and of the shadow of death, without any order and where the light is as darkness."

Who can sum up the grief of the stricken parent, the despair of the worse than widowed wife, and the misery of tainted children, with the shadow of mad parentage overhanging all their lives!

In an ill-defined way most educated people are aware that insanity is on the increase, and they accept the fact much in the same spirit as that with which they accept the hundred and one other unpleasant facts connected with human existence—with absolute indifference. As to origin or prevention, no thought of these subjects ever enters their heads; indifferent and unheeding they go on their way, while the Registrar-General's report, year by year, records an ever-increasing number of victims.

Many capable men argue that this apparent increase in insanity is due to the better administration of the laws respecting persons of unsound mind, coupled with the facts that the insane under modern treatment live longer, and that many persons are now placed in asylums who, in former years, would have eked out their wretched existences in their own homes. It would be idle to deny that there is truth in this; but, on the other hand, the extraordinary advance of medical science, with its wider knowledge and more skilful treatment of the insane and those bordering on insanity, should, in the natural course of things, tend to balance, if not diminish, their numbers.

In his work on *Marriage and Disease* Dr. Strahan says: "I must admit that I go with those who believe mental disease to be on the increase"; and we have not far to seek to find abundant evidence in support of his testimony.

Now, as to the cause of this increase, a careful study of such works as Mandesley's *Pathology of Mind*, Strahan's *Marriage and Disease*, Ribet's *Heredity*, with works by Lombroso, Nisbet, Talbot, and

others; bearing directly or indirectly on the subject, point to the fact that this steady progress in mental disorders is mainly attributable to the influences of heredity.

"Everybody's mental constitution being determined primarily and mainly by his inheritance from his forefathers, and secondarily and in a less degree only by the circumstances of his life and training, the fundamental lines of his character, which have been laid down in the past fix for him, and would, had we full and exact knowledge, fix for us the education of which he is capable and, if so be, the degeneration to which he is doomed."¹

"At the head of mental characteristics whose hereditary nature is apparent, we may place idiocy and insanity."²

"Since the direct cause of insanity is some morbid affection of the nervous system, and as every part of the organism is transmissible, clearly the heredity of mental affections is the rule."³

Quotations from the highest authorities might be added *ad infinitum*.

The evidence in support of the transmissibility of the insane tendency is complete and overwhelming. That the child of an insane parent will be insane does not follow; the workings of heredity are—by the light of our present knowledge—among the uncertain quantities, but this we do know, that he is always liable to develop some allied form of nervous disorder, such as weakness of mind, dipsomania, or suicide; conversely, such weakness in one generation may break out into insanity in the next.

Ribot says that:

"Nothing is more frequent than to see simple insanity become suicidal mania, or suicidal mania become simple insanity, alcoholism or hypochondria."

He proceeds to give the following striking example:

"A goldsmith who had been cured of a first attack of insanity, caused by the Revolution of 1789, took poison; later, his eldest daughter was seized with an attack of mania, passing into dementia; one of her brothers stabbed himself in the stomach with a knife; a second brother gave himself up to drunkenness and ended his career by dying in the streets; a third, owing to domestic annoyance, refused all food and died of anemia. Another daughter, a woman of most capricious temper, married, and had a son and a daughter; the former died insane and epileptic; the latter lost her mind during her lying-in, became hypochondriac, and wished to starve herself to death. Two children of this same woman died of brain fever, and a third would never take the breast."³

The writer is acquainted with the following family history. The father at about the age of twenty-eight became subject to acute attacks of mania, the mother was hysterical and neurotic. The three elder sons of these parents, who have attained the age at which their father first developed symptoms of insanity, have all shown signs of

¹ Maudsley's *Pathology of Mind*.

² Nisbet, *Marriage and Heredity*.

³ Ribot, *Heredity*.

marked degeneration. They have squandered their means, regardless of the consequences, and have given way more or less to alcoholism. One of these men was possessed of quite exceptional ability, and the other two were successful in business until the fatal age, when the hereditary taint proved too strong, bringing disaster and ruin in its train, which every effort on the part of relatives has been powerless to avert.

And to the man sprung from such stock, and who still is endowed with the priceless gifts of physical and mental sanity, the burden of such heritage is intolerable. He knows that under favourable conditions all may be well with him; but he knows, too, that in constant worry and anxiety lies his own chief danger, and in all probability he will unceasingly be harassed and tormented by the vagaries, or worse, of his unstable relatives. Truly the "sins of the fathers" constitute a heavy burden!

So closely are the insane allied to the chronic alcoholists that in the advanced stages of the disease there is merely a distinction without much difference between them.

Chronic alcoholists may be divided into two classes; those who acquire the habit and those who inherit the tendency to do so.

It is needless to enter into details as to the consequences entailed by over indulgence in the use of alcohol. Most of us are familiar with cases of ruined lives and wretched homes as the result of the fatal habit, and in these days of high pressure living it is becoming more and more common. Mental worry, overwork, ill-health, want of sufficient nourishment and clothing, tend to swell the numbers of chronic alcoholists, and the habit so easily acquired is extremely difficult to relinquish.

The real danger to the race, however, lies in the fact that the great majority of inebriates need no incentive to acquire the habit; they are born with the tendency, and it is to this cause chiefly that we must ascribe the increase in the number of deaths from chronic alcoholism during the last twenty-three years. A reference to the table of statistics shows that in 1875 twenty-seven persons in a million died as the result of chronic alcoholism; in 1898 these figures had more than doubled themselves, the number then being returned as sixty-five per million of the population.

The following quotations point to the conclusion arrived at by some of the most eminent men of the day:

"Heredity as a causation is estimated to be present in nearly sixty per cent. of all cases of chronic alcoholism."¹

"Sur 97 enfants nés de parents alcooliques 14 seulement étaient sains."²

"There are not a few human beings so saturated with the taint of

¹ J. E. Usher, *Alcoholism*.

² (Baer, *op. cit.*) Lombroso.

alcoholic heredity that they could as soon 'turn back a flowing river from the sea' as arrest the march of an attack of alcoholism."¹

Much that has been said respecting insanity applies equally to inebriety. Both belong to the group of diseases of the nervous system, showing a marked tendency to degeneration, and both are liable to be transmitted hereditarily.

The analogy in heredity between insanity and inebriety is most marked.

The children of inebriate parents may be insane, and those of insane parents may be inebriates, or the neurotic predisposition may be transmitted in a variety of forms.

Demme of Berne writes :

"The direct posterity of ten families of drunkards, in which alcoholism of one parent or of both, or even of previous generations, is shown, amounted to fifty-seven children; but of these, twenty-five children died during the first weeks or months of life, part of them from lack of vitality, part through eclamptic seizures (edema of the brain and its membranes). Six children were idiots, five children exhibited marked backwardness of growth in height, remaining almost dwarfish; five children, as they became older, were attacked with epilepsy; one boy was attacked with severe chorea, terminating finally in idiocy; five children had congenital diseases. Thus, of fifty-seven children of drunkards, there were only ten, or 17.5 per cent., in a normal condition. Of sixty-one children of ten temperate families fifty, or 81.9 per cent., were normal."

How early the craving for alcohol may be developed is illustrated by the following cases. Dr. Crothers speaks of a neurotic infant, one year of age, who had been given tincture of cinchona :

"In a little time the child cried for the medicine, and nothing would pacify it until it was given."

On investigation, it was found that the baby had an alcoholic mother, who died soon after its birth.

"In a second case, an infant of only two months old could only be reduced to tranquillity by a few drops of spirits."

That children born with such marked signs of drink craving can ever become useful or respectable members of society is a moral impossibility; in consequence it is borne in upon the minds of some unsentimental persons that under certain conditions it becomes a greater crime to give life than to take it. Death is an end to the individual and his procreating powers, while the giving of one tainted life may yield results stretching far away into the future of the human race.

A glance at the cancer statistics will suffice to show how greatly this form of disease is on the increase. In 1875 it claimed 470 victims in every million persons; in 1898 these figures had swollen to 802. Year by year an ever accumulating number of men and

¹ Norman Kerr, *Inebriety*.

women perish by what is truly one of the most terrible ills pertaining to modern life.

Repeatedly, through a long period of years, the Registrar-General calls attention to the increase of deaths from this cause, and in the Sixty-first Blue Book (the latest report issued) he remarks that :

"Cancer appears to have been more fatal both among men and women in 1898 than in any other year on record; the male rate was higher by 19·6 per cent. and the female rate higher by 10·0 per cent. than the corresponding mean rates in the preceding decennium."

In spite of overwhelming evidence, man, as is his wont in the face of unpleasant facts, seeks about wherewith to blind himself, and attempts have been made to prove that this increase is a more or less fictitious one, attributable in a great measure to a better system in the registration of deaths and to the advance of medical science, combined with greater accuracy of diagnosis.

To some extent this may be so, and it should be pointed out that in 1887 a system of enquiry was established respecting deaths indefinitely certified as due to tumours; and an increase of 2·6 per cent. of the deaths from cancer in the seven years 1891-97 are the result of this system. Nevertheless it is a matter of everyday observation, endorsed by the testimony of medical men, who readily acknowledge it, that malignant growths of a cancerous nature are becoming more and more common.

Sir Spencer Wells, in commenting on the increase of cancer between 1861 and 1888, says :

"I think it is hardly possible that this steady increase in twenty-six years from 360 to 610 deaths from cancer among each million persons in England and Wales during that period can be truly attributed to any great extent to better registration, and this opinion is endorsed by many eminent men."

Cancer is, perhaps, the most terrible form of disease to which man is subject.

Only those who have come into immediate contact with it, who have had the misfortune to nurse their dear ones through its long drawn out agony, can realise the full horror of it in all its stages; the awful misery, the excruciating pain, which our boasted medical skill can do but little to alleviate, the anguish and despair of those unfortunate beings whose only outlook is a "steady progress towards death."

The mental and physical torture, attended too often with hideous and loathsome details, may well cause the most indifferent observer to say: "It were better for this man had he never been born"; while those who are drawn by ties of tender relationship can only pray that speedy death—barbarously denied to the sufferer by the

ethical standards of our moral code—may, at last, bring relief and peace.

Among savages and the uncivilised races of men, where the great natural law of the "survival of the fittest" obtains full sway, this dire disease is practically unknown; only as man moves onwards in the march of so-called civilisation does it spread and gather full force in its work of destruction.

In a work recently published by Dr. Herbert Snow, he says :

"Cancer is a disease of civilisation, almost restricted to the civilised state. The species contributing most to the mortality statistics are those directly associated with the increased worry, trouble, and anxiety which modern civilisation brings in its train."

And again he says :

"Mental distress, worry, and anxiety form the immediate excitant in about 90 per cent. of cases."

Dr. Strahan, in his work on *Marriage and Disease*, remarks :

"That this is so is, I think, proved by the manner in which it increases with what we are pleased to call civilisation, that is, where the interference with the laws of nature is most marked."

And again and again in works on this subject the same opinion is expressed by eminent men who have had ample opportunity of studying the subject.

To quote once more from the Registrar-General's report :

"Should equal percentages of increase be maintained in future years, they would bring up the rates of cancer mortality to 1781 per million among males and females about the year 1932."

The amount of suffering entailed by these figures is appalling to contemplate.

Whatever the diversity of opinion may be as to the causation of cancer, there is the strongest evidence to prove that it is almost invariably the outcome of impaired vitality, resulting in constitutional degeneration; and that—in this lies its chief menace to the race—a predisposition to contract the disease can be transmitted hereditarily, and to this cause mainly must be attributed its alarming increase during the last forty years.

Sir James Paget remarks :

"Now I can without difficulty count as actual facts not less than one in three of patients with cancer in whose families the occurrence of cancer is known."

As an example he gives the following case :

"A lady died of cancer of the stomach; of her children, one daughter died of cancer of the stomach and another of cancer of the breast, two of

cancer of the uterus, one of cancer of the bladder, one of cancer of the axillary glands, one of cancer of the stomach, and one of cancer of the rectum."

The writer knows of an instance of a husband and a wife who both died of cancer, the man of cancer of the larynx, the woman of cancer of the rectum.

The man's father was said to have died of "something internal," the woman's mother of an "internal tumour"; such vague descriptions were usual half a century ago, and in both cases it was supposed that the predisposition was inherited.

It is needless to multiply instances in support of the theory that a predisposition to develop cancer may be inherited; reference to the works already mentioned afford ample evidence on the subject, and any one interested cannot do better than study them.

At the present time the most eminent scientists in the medical world are labouring unceasingly to find a cancer cure; alarmed by the headway it is making, they are straining every nerve in their efforts, but, so far, the surgeon's knife appears to be the only means they have of stemming its ravages, and permanent cure is rarely effected.

An effort has been made in the foregoing brief outline to make clear how imperative it is that the present generation be taught to face certain hard facts connected with modern existence, so that practical steps may be taken to provide for the welfare of posterity. Thoughtful persons know that the day of indifference must end, and the longer the delay, the more sure and terrible will be the retribution.

Mr. W. R. Greg says :

"Three generations of wholesome life might suffice to eliminate the ancestral poison, for the *vis medicatrix nature* has wonderful efficacy when allowed free play, and perhaps the time may come when the worst cases shall deem it a plain duty to curse no future generations with the *damnosa hereditas* which has caused such bitter wretchedness to themselves."

The time is long in coming, but, believing in the ultimate triumph of truth and goodness, we may look to a future when the rights of the unborn child will be fully recognised by the State, as well as by the individual. In education, in its highest sense, lies the salvation of humanity, and already there is a faint murmur in the air betokening the coming of a higher form of civilisation, built up on the foundations of unselfishness and renunciation, whose citizens, daring to face the truth and acting on its teaching, will stamp out these seeds, which to-day constitute the gravest of perils to the future of the civilised races of the world.

And let not the men and women who have eyes to see and ears to hear with grow weary and faint-hearted with long waiting. One

feather from the wing of the great white bird of truth has fallen upon them, and they must know that their thought of to-day will be the thought of all men to-morrow—and thought will be followed by action.

Let us remember :

“ Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,

* * * * *

Lead life to sovereign power.”

H. GIFFARD-RUFFE.

IRELAND MILITANT.

SINCE the fall and death of Charles Stewart Parnell, Ireland has not loomed very large on the parliamentary horizon. Irish questions were but little to the front, and Irish representatives presented themselves to the House of Commons as an assemblage of jarring atoms, jostling each other aside in the struggle for notoriety, and caring very little how either their individual dignity or the interests of their country might suffer in such an unseemly contest. It was not to be expected, therefore, that Englishmen would care much for what Irishmen themselves so persistently disregarded. Ireland practically dropped out of the calculations of all English parties, many consoling themselves with the thought that the Local Government Bill of 1898 had finally settled the whole Irish question, and all believing that in any case no revival of it was possible within the present generation. Now that all these calculations have been upset by the reappearance in the House of Commons of the Irish Party as an organised and determined fighting force, it may not be uninteresting to discuss at some length the rise of this new movement, and the state of affairs in Ireland with which it synchronises.

The iron hand with which Mr. Parnell ruled his parliamentary followers, and which enabled him to obtain good results out of often unpromising material, was no sooner removed than it became obvious that his absolutism had had evil as well as good effects. His followers, accustomed to trust everything to the genius of their leader, had lost all capacity for judicious initiative, for self-restraint, for individual action. They spoke and acted wildly, sparred at one another indiscriminately, and reduced political life in Ireland to an almost unexampled level of scurrilous personal attack. Nor was the spirit of faction confined to the members of Parliament; it triumphed over the spirit of patriotism amongst the masses of the people as well. Every parish, every village, was the scene of a fierce internal conflict. And to dissension speedily succeeded its natural consequence, apathy. Disgusted with the manner in which their chosen representatives were behaving, as well as disheartened by the defeat of the Home Rule Bill of 1893, and by the great Unionist reaction of 1895, the Irish people lost their interest in politics. The frantic endeavours of the rival leaders to rouse their flagging enthusiasm only succeeded in plunging them into still deeper torpor. In a poor

country, whose representatives must always be maintained at the public expense, public apathy means the death of parliamentary activity. Five or six members of the Party, men of sufficient wealth to defray their own expenses, continued a spasmodic fight at Westminster against overwhelming odds; the rest stayed at home, attended to their private affairs, and paid no more attention to Parliament than was shown in crossing the Irish Sea about twice a year to take part in some full-dress debate. At home, the old "physical force" party began to revive. It was dormant under Parnell, because he had convinced the people of the possibility of gaining their rights by strictly constitutional means. Now it reappeared, gaining strength with the discrediting of parliamentarianism. National energy found vent, in many places, in a number of smaller issues. But of active, vigorous political life there was no trace.

Such was the state of things when, in January 1898, William O'Brien founded the United Irish League, the organisation which was destined to effect such a change in Ireland as to rouse the people from apathetic indifference into fierce fighting trim in less than three years. Starting from humble beginnings, in the extreme west of Connaught, it rapidly overran the whole island, and now but few parishes in the country are unprovided with a branch. The secret of this success was that the League from the first ignored the sectional quarrels, and invited *all* Nationalists to join in fighting the common enemy—the party of English ascendancy, of Protestant ascendancy, of landlord ascendancy. It chose for its first point of attack the most vulnerable spot in the enemy's lines—those Land Laws which have been constantly condemned and constantly tinkered at by Liberal and Tory alike, and which are yet far from giving satisfaction or producing prosperity in Ireland. In opposition to the landlords, all Nationalists were found to be at one; in the act of speaking together on the same platforms against the same opponents, the recent strife was forgotten, the old spirit came back to the people. Only one thing was wanting to consecrate the League, to render it sacred in the people's eyes—persecution; and this essential element was supplied when Mr. Gerald Balfour began to suppress League meetings and had the people batoned in violation of the right of free speech. From that time the triumph of the United Irish League was assured.

As the League spread it widened its programme. Originally a purely agrarian association, it included in its objects, one by one, all the items of the full Nationalist demand. Meantime several efforts, springing from different sources, had been made to heal up the divisions between the Nationalist M.P.s, and to convert them into one harmonious body; but, owing to the erratic temperament of certain of the members, all failed. Thus, at the beginning of last year, the curious spectacle presented itself of a united country repre-

sented by a divided and mutually warring party. The League, conscious of its strength in the country, now began to give indications of a desire to interfere in parliamentary elections; and this alarmed those *faineant* members who had hitherto considered the letters "M.P." as a fixture after their names, and had never dreamt of being called to an account by the country. There seemed every prospect of a keen contest, at the coming General Election, between the League and the Party (or Parties); the latter strengthened by old memories, the former by newly-awakened enthusiasm. To Mr. John Redmond is due the honour of averting such a conflict. Perceiving the strength of the new movement, and its inclusion of all that was best in Irish Nationalism, he decided, with statesmanlike prescience, to put himself at the head of it, to join forces with Mr. O'Brien, and to bring with him, if possible, the hitherto hostile M.P.s. He succeeded, in February of last year, in bringing about a reunion of the members into one Party, of which he himself was then elected chairman; and in June the union of Party and country was cemented at the National Convention, which declared the United Irish League to be "the National Organisation." But much was yet to be done before the nominal union could be made real, and the "united" Party transformed into a fighting one. Many of the members had been forced into professing friendship with their comrades simply through fear of feeling the League's power at the General Election; and it was plain that they were but awaiting a renewal of confidence by the electorate to re-open the old feuds. The League steadily prepared for fight; the country readily furnished the necessary funds; and although the suddenly sprung dissolution prevented complete preparation, the short, sharp struggle which followed saw the League victorious. All who were suspected, who refused to endorse the fighting policy of the League, found their seats insecure. Much new blood, badly needed, was infused into the moribund Party. Only in four constituencies, out of the eighty commonly returning Nationalists, were candidates opposed to the League returned; and two of these subsequently found it best to make their peace with the League and were allowed to enter the Party. The two who were excluded from the Party as finally constituted have no backing in the country, and are powerless, even though one of them is so redoubtable a free-lance as Mr. T. M. Healy.

Many features stamp the new movement as a genuinely democratic one, and as having in it the seeds of progress. It is entirely free from those curses of most Irish political movements—one-man power and clericalism. A glance at the organisation which makes this possible may not be devoid of interest. The United Irish League consists, primarily, of a branch in every parish, each parish being allowed one branch and no more (with exceptions in the case of

cities, which are preferably enrolled by wards). The members of each branch elect their own officers, retain for local purposes all the funds of the branch except a small contribution to the Central Executive, and have in their own hands the complete control and guidance of the movement within their own district. Delegates from all the branches in a constituency constitute the Divisional Executive, which, in turn, undertakes the management of all matters affecting the constituency at large, and in particular advises the parliamentary representative of the division (who is, in many cases, chairman of the Executive). The central National Directory of the League is composed of one delegate from each Divisional Executive, together with the chairman and officers of the parliamentary party. This body, of some ninety members, is presided over by the chairman of the party, in his capacity as President of the League; it has supreme control of all matters of universal interest (the questions of Home Rule, Catholic University, and Financial Relations, &c.) affecting the movement and the country as a whole; and the method of its selection ensures its being in touch with the people. Moreover, its meetings are few, its duties small, and the funds it has to administer are trifling. The actual work is decentralised as far as possible, which enables the League to adapt its policy to the circumstances of each particular district; each Divisional Executive, with its network of branches, being in effect an association for the redress of local grievances and the selection of such representatives in Parliament and on public boards as are best fitted to deal with local needs. Thus, the majority of the constituencies being rural, most of the branches and Divisional Executives are concerned mainly with agrarian matters: but in urban constituencies such questions as the housing of the poor and the rights of town tenants are the foremost planks on the League's programme. While being thus wide enough to embrace the democracy of the whole country, the connection of all districts through the National Directory enables the whole force of public opinion to be concentrated, in case of need, on any one spot where a particularly glaring case of injustice has to be fought. Thus, much more power is gained than could be possible with separate and distinct associations; and at the same time the whole country is kept in touch with the great central fight for legislative independence.

It will be at once obvious that such an organisation as this renders impossible anything like dictation or the power of a "boss." In the old days members of Parliament were the nominees of Parnell, whose will was law in every Nationalist constituency; now the M.P. is selected at a Convention summoned, on a representative basis, by the Divisional Executive; he takes his mandate from the Divisional Executive, and feels directly responsible to it. As the members are thus the mouthpieces of the League, so is the chairman

the mouthpiece of the united members. It is true that the present chairman, Mr. Redmond, is much more than a mere mouthpiece; in the period of transition, of settling down into order and harmony, much has been due to his tact and judgment, but he has shown these qualities quite as much by non-interference as by personal action. Anything like the dictatorship of an "Uncrowned King" is henceforth impossible; and that in itself indicates a great advance, and promises to afford a most beneficial and much-needed training in organisation and self-government to the Irish people.

The evil of clericalism, which was formerly kept in subjection by the dictatorship of Parnell, has been removed by the same system which removes the possibility of dictatorship. It is true that many priests, and even a few bishops, are members of the United Irish League, but their influence is, under the League's constitution, precisely proportioned to their merit as individual Nationalists, not to their position as clergymen. As a body, the Irish Catholic hierarchy and clergy of to-day, those who have been sent forth with the Maynooth stamp, are not National in sentiment at all; they are imbued with the usual clerical distaste for enfranchising movements, and are, for the most part, linked to the patriot party only by the accident that the system of government which is anti-Irish is also to a great extent anti-Catholic. Were a Catholic University for Ireland granted to-morrow, we should find that but a small percentage of the Irish priesthood would care to continue the fight for Home Rule. This being so, it is not surprising to find that most of the bishops and clergy stand aloof from the United Irish League, or even condemn it as "revolutionary" or "immoral." All over the country, at the General Election, the clerics waged an uncompromising war against the League. That they were overwhelmingly beaten everywhere—notably in Mayo, in Meath, and in Tipperary—and that their sole remaining parliamentary champion is Mr. T. M. Healy, are circumstances worthy the consideration of those broad-minded Englishmen who regard Ireland as a priest-ridden country.

The success of the United Irish League in reorganising the scattered Nationalist forces was largely due to its action in placing the Land Question in the forefront of its programme. The debate on Mr. John Redmond's amendment to the Address has clearly shown the unanimity with which all sections of Irishmen condemn the existing condition of the Land Laws and their administration. The alliance, on behalf of Compulsory Purchase, of the Nationalists and Mr. T. W. Russell, so long one of the chief pillars of Northern Unionism, should be enough to demonstrate once for all that only by the speedy establishment of a peasant proprietary can the Irish Land Question be solved. But the Irish Party and the United Irish League have no intention of trusting to debates in Parliament alone. Taking as their cue Lord Salisbury's words, that Compulsory Land

Purchase is impossible "under existing circumstances," they are determined to alter the "circumstances" by a vigorous agrarian campaign in the country. The weapons used will be, as usual, non-payment of rent and boycotting; care being taken to keep within the law. The United Irish League has, from the outset, preserved itself absolutely free from any stain of crime, and has made a point of impressing on its members the fatal consequences of any violence or outrage. By continuing in this career of vigorous yet irreproachable agitation, it is hardly too much to hope that the United Irish League will induce Lord Salisbury to reconsider his position and to climb down gracefully once more.

Another portion of the agrarian policy of the League is not so universally approved, and is viewed by many with grave suspicion. This is the attack on the grazing ranches. Of late years the quantity of land under tillage in Ireland has been decreasing, cultivation being replaced by grazing. Small holdings are grouped together into large grass tracts, devoted to the raising of cattle for the English market. The tillage land is thus less and less able to support those who formerly found on it their whole subsistence; numbers of small agriculturists find themselves unable to live in the country without suddenly changing their habits and adapting themselves to some new occupation, always a practically insurmountable stumbling-block to a peasant class. So they either starve or emigrate. In many places, tenant-farmers have been turned out of their small holdings for the express purpose of amalgamating them with the neighbouring grazier's property; for the grazier, as richer and more enterprising, is preferred as a tenant by most landlords. Urged on by the prick of hunger, the people have demanded, through their organisation, that these grazing farms shall be given up by the holders, and shall be split up again into small holdings, for the planting thereon of the old tenants. "The land must raise men, not bullocks," is their cry. In this, however, many people see a tendency towards Socialism. They argue, with some show of reason, that the grazier, as a tenant, has a right to undisturbed possession of his holding; that to interfere with his disposal of that holding, whether he employs it in tillage or grazing, is to arrogate to the people at large a voice in the control of an individual's landed property: which is opposed to the system of peasant proprietorship, and is Socialism pure and simple. In reality, however, it is only by some such action as the United Irish League adopts that Socialism can be prevented from taking root in Ireland. This apparent paradox will become plain on a little consideration. If the farmers of Ireland find themselves gradually, but steadily, losing their only means of sustenance, if they see the land becoming concentrated in a few hands, and devoted to the breeding of cattle for exportation, they will most assuredly soon raise the cry for Land Nationalisation.

It is known that one or two Irish leaders already favour this solution on principle, but are willing to assent to the scheme of peasant proprietorship if that scheme can be well worked. But if the peasant is dispossessed by the grazier, and the country is depopulated and turned into one vast grazing ranch, then it seems inevitable that the State should take over the land and administer it itself for the benefit of all. This acceptance of Socialistic principles can only be prevented by using the force of organised public opinion for the elimination of the grazier.

Second only to the land agitation in its hold on the Irish imagination comes, at present, the remarkable movement for the revival of the Irish language. Some attention has recently been drawn to this revival by the attempt of Mr. Thomas O'Donnell to make an Irish speech in Parliament; but its origin, its aims, and its strength are scarcely at all known in Great Britain. The Gaelic language, which was the tongue of all Ireland down to a few centuries ago, still survives as a spoken language along the whole of the western seaboard, and in a few other spots scattered over the island, but is gradually dying out before the advance of English. The present movement aims not only at preserving it in those districts where it is still spoken, but at spreading it all over the country as the principal tongue of the land. This attempt had its origin in the political dissension and apathy which followed the fall of Parnell. Many true Nationalists who had grown disgusted with political work, wishing to find some outlet for their strong patriotic sentiment, diverted it into a passionate attachment to the "old tongue of the Gael." In the absence of any great popular agitation the movement grew and flourished, directed by the Gaelic League. It has now made converts in most unexpected quarters (such as Mr. George Moore), and pervades, more or less visibly, the greater part of Ireland—so far, at least, as sentimental approval goes. Altogether apart from the merits of the change advocated by the Gaelic revivalists, the spirit which they are stirring up in the country makes for good. The undoubted earnestness and enthusiasm of the leaders of the revival, the steady determination with which they pursue their ideal, afford of themselves a valuable lesson, and one worthy of imitation, for the masses of the people; nor is that lesson being wholly lost. Then, too, the classes, lectures, social and musical gatherings held under the auspices of the Gaelic League cannot fail at least to have a stimulating and refining effect on the rising generation (whom it is their desire chiefly to attract), and to direct to the history, literature, and antiquities of Ireland an amount of attention which should certainly prove fruitful in mental culture and subsequent creative activity. But though the Gaelic League is thus incidentally benefiting the country, its direct objects can scarcely be accorded an unqualified approval. These objects are

four in number: two beneficial, two retrograde and detrimental to the best interests of Ireland and Irishmen. The first is to secure bi-lingual education for the children in Irish-speaking districts—that is, to procure that these children shall be taught English and other subjects through the medium of Irish, the language spoken in the home circle. The present system, whereby the child is given a parrot-knowledge of English which he forgets on leaving school, is fatal to all true education, and only retards the natural progress of the English language in those remote districts.

The second object of the Gaelic League is equally praiseworthy: namely, to promote the study of ancient Irish literature, which at present is much better known to the Germans than to the Irish, and which, though not containing anything of the *greatest* in literature, contains much that is valuable, and could not fail to act as a powerful mental stimulus to the people in whose land it was composed and whose ancestors it celebrates. But, not satisfied with this, the Gaelic League further demands that Irish shall be spread over the whole country and accepted as “the national language of Ireland,” adding, as its fourth object, the corollary that a modern literature in Irish shall be created. Passing over the absurdity of supposing that literature can be *created* by a league of any kind, the vague nature of the chief claim should be noticed. The official programme of the League says nothing about what is to be done with English if their scheme succeeds. But the responsible chiefs of the movement have perceived the necessity of disclaiming all hostility to the English language; they publicly advocate national bi-lingualism, and are never tired of extolling the advantages possessed by nations speaking two languages; they point in especial to the example of Wales as one to be followed, wilfully blinding themselves to the evil effects on the Welsh people produced by their obstinate clinging to an obsolete tongue; and they insist that in their projected bi-lingual system Irish Gaelic must be *the principal language*. The great body of Gaelic Leaguers go further than their chiefs, and make no concealment of their desire to have the English language driven out altogether. For, all the old “physical force” men, who will have no compromise with England, who claim nothing less than an Irish Republic (and who, as has been said already, have gained strength from the abject failure of parliamentarianism for some years past), are ardent Gaelic revivalists; mostly men of no culture, they hate the English language because it *is* English, and (though obliged to use it in their denunciations!) clamour for its complete disuse in Ireland. However, the Gaelic League, officially considered, holds itself carefully aloof from politics; and it is a striking circumstance that within its ranks are found, side by side with the extremists just mentioned, men whose political views are at the opposite pole—men

like the O'Connor Don, Conservatives and Unionists—who see in the Irish language question an excellent red-herring to trail across the path of political democracy. The parliamentary politicians, the United Irish Leaguers, are therefore banned by the “Keltomaniacs,” who, proclaiming themselves as the custodians of “the soul of the Irish nation,” despise those who are gross enough to agitate merely for the nation’s material prosperity! There is, consequently, an undercurrent of hostility between the Gaelic League and the United Irish League; for both of the extreme sections who compose the former are opposed to the practical constitutional programme of the latter. There is no open warfare; instead, each party endeavours to use the other for its own purposes. The Gaelic League calls on the United Irish League to utilise its public meetings for the propagation of Irish by speeches made therein; the United Irish League upbraids the Gaelic League for not using its power for political purposes, and to some extent takes the wind out of its sails by placing the “revival of the Irish language” on its programme—as the last article on the list, after ten items of more practical value. Some few even manage to be enthusiastic members of both leagues, the most notable of whom is Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.

It may reasonably be expected that the better part of the Gaelic League’s labours will survive and bear fruit, while its more extravagant aims will be swamped by the still rising tide of political enthusiasm, just as they found birth amid the deadening of all true combative national spirit. In order to stave off the evil day of extinction, the “Keltomaniacs” are now endeavouring to show that some connection exists between their movement and that now arising in support of Irish manufactures; that, in fact, in spite of their bombastic words on “the soul of the Irish nation,” they have condescended to care for its body also! The impression which they would fain produce is, however, a misleading one. An industrial revival certainly seems to be in progress in Ireland, but it is in no sense due to the action of the Gaelic League or the United Irish League, although the credit is claimed by both; it is rather another and a distinct symptom of the re-awakening of Irishmen to militant activity. This movement for the preferential purchase of Irish manufactures has given rise to one or two local industrial leagues (recently federated under a central executive), but none of them have hitherto attained noticeable dimensions, and as yet the chief strength of the movement lies in the *Leader*, a new penny weekly published in Dublin, which, though disfigured by much vapouring about “the soul of the Irish nation,” many reckless attacks on Irish public men, and a quantity of utterly irrelevant and uninformed social and literary criticism, is nevertheless doing good national work in calling attention to the many articles imported

from England and abroad which could be equally well procured at home. It is distinguished by its insistence on sound economics, and is emphatic in its warnings against the dangers of anything like Protection, against buying any article solely because it is of Irish manufacture, without regard to price or quality. Its recommendations meet with ready support from the consumers; its hardest task is to rouse the supine Irish manufacturers, whom it has dubbed the "Dark Brotherhood" on account of their fatal lack of enterprise in pushing their wares, and especially their total neglect of advertising.

The question of University education, so important for Irish prosperity, at present excites little or no interest among the people. The uncultivated masses are quite unable to comprehend how they can be affected by University education, their idea of a University being a place for the sons of the rich, and their leaders take no great trouble to enlighten them. This is due to the fact that those who really understand the problem can come to no agreement as to the best method of solving it. The Roman Catholic clergy undoubtedly desire a University of which they themselves shall have the chief control, directly or indirectly; and, so far, the hesitation and doubt with which the Irish claim is regarded by Nonconformist Liberals is palpably well-founded. But what is not generally known is that the political leaders who are now in the ascendant in Ireland, though Roman Catholics, are not in the least disposed to submit to clerical dictation in the field of education any more than in the field of politics; and they are equally resolved to have a lay University for laymen. Whenever the question comes up for discussion in any tangible form, these differences, now concealed, are certain to reveal themselves. But if the matter were threshed out in detail in the Imperial Parliament, the very fact of being taunted by Englishmen with submission to clerical dictation would rouse the Nationalist leaders to defiance of English opinion, and they would throw in their lot with the clergy rather than incur the reproach of deserting them while England looked on. If, on the contrary, the matter is postponed until Home Rule is won, then, in a Parliament of their own, free from English supervision, the laymen would fight hard against the priestly influence, and would probably win. And the consciousness of this, as much as anything else, is at the root of Mr. John Redmond's frequently expressed opinion that the question will never be settled until a Home Rule Parliament is first granted. The problem is further complicated by the claims of a third party—the Jesuits. Their ideal, plainly, is a Jesuit University, independent alike of laymen and of the secular clergy. They talk less than the other parties, but they are steadily working to consolidate their position at the head of the Catholic College in Dublin. By a series of questionable appointments to fellowships, often made without

regard to academic distinction, they have succeeded in establishing themselves firmly within the Royal University; and they hope, when a University scheme is announced, to be able to put forward a strong case for their predominance within the new institution. The average lay Irishman, Roman Catholic and Home Ruler as he is, only hopes that the rivalry between the Jesuits and the secular clergy may result in the proverbial windfall to honest men.

The Financial Relations question, so much talked of a few years ago, excites absolutely no interest in Ireland to-day. It is on the programme of the United Irish League as one of the grievances to be redressed, but it is not a living issue. The people in general have not sufficient economic education to grasp the bearings of the question on their daily life; and Mr. Sexton, the one politician who could have made such an abstract subject clear to his countrymen, is still in retirement.

I have tried, in the course of this article, to show as succinctly as possible the chief phases in the revival of Ireland as a militant force, as well as to indicate the probable trend of this revival in the future. Writing as an Irishman, my aim in doing so is to endeavour to let the average Englishman know and understand something of the circumstances of the case with which he must deal. I do not think that any one, either Irish or English, can set before himself a better task than to clear away something of that mutual misunderstanding which has so long kept apart in conflict two peoples so eminently fitted, by genius and environment, to supplement each other and to blend in a genuine, harmonious union.

TIMON.

LABOUR QUESTIONS AND EMPIRE.

AMID all the changes consequent on the policy of one Government or another there is a question of perennial and paramount importance, the question of labour. Changes of Government hitherto have but accentuated the necessity for a thorough understanding of this great subject. Science and art daily add fresh laurels to the already great triumphs of man over the forces of nature, inventions multiply, and wealth is produced with an ease and rapidity incredible to the men of even a generation ago, yet poverty persists.

Henry George, in stating the problem in the introduction to his now world-wide famous "inquiry into the cause of industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth," *Progress and Poverty*, says of the century which has just closed :

"At the beginning of this marvellous era it was natural to expect, and it was expected, that labour-saving inventions would lighten toil and improve the condition of the labourer; that the enormous increase in the power of producing wealth would make real poverty a thing of the past. Could a man of the last century—a Franklin or a Priestly—have seen in a vision of the future the steamship taking the place of the sailing vessel, the railroad train of the waggon, the reaping-machine of the scythe, the threshing-machine of the flail; could he have heard the throb of the engines that, in obedience to human will and for the satisfaction of human desire, exert a power greater than that of all the beasts of burden of the earth combined; could he have seen the forest-tree transformed into finished lumber—into doors, sashes, blinds, boxes or barrels, with hardly the touch of a human hand; the great workshops where boots and shoes are turned out by the case with less labour than the old-fashioned cobbler could have put on a sole; the factories where, under the eye of a girl, cotton becomes cloth faster than hundreds of stalwart weavers could have turned it out with their hand-looms; could he have seen steam-hammers shaping mammoth shafts and mighty anchors, and delicate machinery making tiny watches; the diamond-drill cutting through the heart of the rocks, and coal-oil sparing the whale; could he have realised the enormous saving of labour resulting from improved facilities of exchange and communication—sheep killed in Australia eaten fresh in England, and the order given by the London banker in the afternoon executed in San Francisco in the morning of the same day; could he have conceived of the hundred thousand improvements which these only suggest, what would he have inferred as to the social condition of mankind? . . . Plainly, in the sight of the imagination, he would have beheld these new forces elevating society from its very foundations, lifting the very poorest above the possibility of want, exempting the very lowest from anxiety for the material needs of life, he would have seen these slaves of the lamp of knowledge

taking on themselves the traditional curse, these muscles of iron and sinews of steel making the poorest labourer's life a holiday, in which every high quality and noble impulse could have scope to grow."

I have quoted George at some length, because, in the wide domain of literature no less than in the troubled arena of political conflict, no man at any time has approached this great subject with such largeness of heart, such self-denying fearlessness of purpose, and such consummate intellectual ability.

Notwithstanding all this, competition grows keener and keener, assuming at times the fierceness of the strife of hungry vultures over carrion. The cares, anxieties, and responsibilities of business men deepen, while the labourer, no matter how hard he works, ekes out but a precarious subsistence. To masses of men and women created in the image of God even this is denied, leaving nothing but the almshouse, prostitution, beggary, or thieving, whereby they can sustain their miserable existence in a world which seems so inhospitable and callous. Most thoughtful men admit that something is wrong, but the difficulty seems one of locating the disease. Even the powerful and privileged class, which lives wholly upon the labour of others, shows at times signs of uneasiness and fear, protesting that the well-being of the State is their constant and highest concern.

Now it is self-evident that that State must be the happiest, the most enduring, and the most powerful where wealth is distributed among its members in proportion to the value of their labour. In such a State bloated and enervating fortunes would be rare, and even impossible. Slavish fear and involuntary poverty would be unknown. Men, instead of grovelling at the feet of Mammon, would pay homage to character and character alone, while plenty and true well-being would be the reward of the industrious. This is no vision impossible of realisation; it obtains now in greater or less degree where men are more or less free; and it would obtain generally were all men free. One thing is certain to all reflecting men, the present strain cannot increase much more; either relief must come, or the inevitable break. Labour questions are not mere questions of superficial conditions, such as the necessity for Factory Acts, Employers' Liability Acts, sliding scales of wages, or eight hour days. The solution of the labour problem demands something more radical, more stable and enduring than any or all of these temporary legislative shifts. It demands free economic conditions for the labourer, the abolition of privilege and monopoly, and the opening up of the natural opportunities for employment. While these are bought and sold as at present, it follows that men are bought and sold, and are, in reality if not in form, mere chattels, helpless and hopeless, fit subjects for the charitably disposed and for the care of the State.

What are the conditions of labour to-day? For a generation labour has been politically enfranchised, having successfully overthrown, first, the tyranny of the king, and, secondly, the tyranny of the middle class. To-day it stands in possession of political freedom, and still the essential features of tyranny remain. Political freedom therefore is not sufficient: it is only the means whereby labour may achieve economic freedom, the complement of political freedom, and without which political freedom is a mere mockery. There are two classes of reformers at work endeavouring to improve the condition of labour—the social and political and the moral and religious reformers. The former class may very frequently embody the latter so far as the spirit of their work is concerned, but the latter class are unique and profess to effect all that is necessary without resorting to political action. The principal schemes of the social reformers are socialism, trades unionism, co-operation, and temperance. The moral and religious reformers rely, for the most part, on religious ordinance, but, as John Ruskin says, “the mistake of the best men in all ages has been the preaching of patience, and faith, and hope, and every other emollient, consolatory and otherwise, except that which God orders—justice.” They are likewise ardent and liberal supporters of organised charities, forgetful often of the stern, eternal fact that charity must ever be vain while justice is denied. The two great parties in the State are also by profession social reformers. It is generally the policy of Socialists to write and speak as if they alone were the true exponents of the claims of labour and the guardians of its highest interests. Socialists, in spite of their noble aspirations, believe that men in a state of freedom would trample on and devour each other as they now do in a state of thralldom; consequently they look for salvation to the State ownership and regulation of all industry. But, given equal opportunities, men with their God-appointed faculties need neither bureaucrats nor aristocrats to lord it over them, and when Socialists perceive this truth in all its fulness they must change their policy, or become the conscious instead of being, as at present, the mere unwitting jackals of reaction.

The solution of the labour problem, if it is to be found, must be such that it applies equally to all men. It is not a question of what are the rights of a section of men, but *what are the rights of all men*. It is the ignoring of this fundamental proposition that has caused, and is causing, many sections of otherwise earnest social reformers to dissipate their energies in a thousand different directions, to secure measures which, in the very nature of things, can only remotely palliate the evils they desire to cure.

No intelligent man will deny that, as we are constituted, it is necessary that the material needs of men be first satisfied before even a thought can be bestowed upon their higher development.

To the starving man the thought which possesses him absolutely, to the exclusion of all others, is food, and how to obtain it. Equally dominant with the naked and shelterless are the thoughts of clothing and of home, while those who have but a stinted and precarious possession of these means of subsistence become the easy prey of despair, brood-mother of a thousand nameless vices and sorrows. The moral man is foundationed on the animal man; food man must have first, and clothing and shelter, before he can bestow even a thought upon his Maker. This is a conception of man which all reformers must grasp to the full before their aspirations can even in a remote degree be realised, before any permanent or satisfactory work can be achieved. We are told by the moral and religious reformers that what a man wants is a new heart. We agree to this proposition, but truly the first thing to secure is a man.

Now the material necessities of man's life do not come to him by accident or by miracle. Even the naked savages of sunnier climes must gather the wild fruits of nature, dig and arrange their caves, or enslave others of their tribe to do these things for them. Similarly, in civilised communities the material objects which are absolutely necessary for the support of man's life, such as food, clothing, and houses, are the products of his labour impressed upon the raw materials of the earth—the dwelling-place of the generations of men.

Labour questions, therefore, in the first instance, transcend all others, as they involve not only a consideration of the wealth produced, without which civilised life becomes impossible, but the direction in which that wealth is distributed. To understand them we must understand the principles underlying the production of wealth; understanding these, we shall see in their true perspective the other questions which we are asked to attach so much importance to, such as empire, militarism, trade, and taxation. Even the vexed questions of Church and State, and the great temperance question, which is, after all, largely a taxation question, will be better seen in the light of this knowledge. Labour questions are of no parochial order; they are as wide as the industrial association of men extends. So long as men fail to see this, so long will they waste much of their energy in propagating State socialism, trades unionism, and organised co-operation, to say nothing of the noble but often misguided efforts of those who would fain reconstitute society upon a charitable basis.

Trades unionism has at times been the means of raising wages, or, at least, has been able to prevent a reduction in wages. This, however, is but on the surface of things. The truth is, that any increase of wages must come out of increased prices to the consumer, or be taken from rent or from increased production. If it comes out of

increased prices to the consumer, it is quite evident that the wages of the general community are reduced to that extent; consequently, viewing wages as a whole, it cannot be maintained that any improvement has taken place, other men being poorer just to the extent that trades unionism has increased for the time being the wages of a section. If the increase in wages, however, be taken from economic rent, the general benefit to workers of every grade is assured, economic rent being the toll which land monopoly levies on all industry for the use of natural opportunity. Natural opportunities exist apart from, and are independent of, the labour of men; they are the benefits of the Creator, free to all alike, and until these become the equal possession of all men, wages cannot possibly be said to have increased; as a matter of fact, if we view the enormous strides which have been and are continually being made in the easy and rapid production of wealth, wages relatively have really fallen. The temporary advantages, therefore, achieved by trades unionism, often gained at enormous cost and suffering, are speedily absorbed by rent exactions of one kind or another. The monopolist sits tighter than ever, limiting increasingly the opportunities to labour, while his position becomes increasingly lucrative as wages advance. The source from which all other monopolies derive their strength is land monopoly; *it is the arch enemy of labour*, and, like a mighty sponge, it soaks up all the advantages of social, moral, and material progress.

Some time ago the labourers in the Admiralty dockyards made a demand for an increase of wages. Mr. Goschen, in replying to them in the House of Commons, said that an increase of wages would not go to the labourers, but to the sweating landlord. The labourers recently had received an increase of 2s. per week, and rents had gone up 20 per cent.

Mr. John Colville, in the House of Commons some time ago, said that trade was good in Motherwell, and wages had risen, but the advantages did not remain with the working men of Motherwell, but had been taken by the landlords in higher rents. It was a crying shame and a positive disgrace.

I merely take the opportunity of mentioning men of such divergent political views as Mr. Goschen and Mr. Colville to show that when any man, independent of political bias, faithfully addresses himself to the solution of the labour problem he cannot fail to see that so-called increases of wages are not what they are imagined to be by those who fight so desperately for them, and further, that when obtained they are speedily transferred to the pockets of the land monopolist.

Trades unionism has not only failed to discover and attack the arch enemy of labour, but it has also mistaken, and up to the present seems determined to mistake, cause for effect. For example,

it holds as a cardinal principle that the easy and rapid production of wealth is an evil; it looks with suspicion on labour-saving machines, and frequently prevents its members from working them.

Labour-saving machines are not the cause of unemployed men. If such were the case, then the labour problem could only be solved by reverting to the use of primitive tools. The wheelbarrow is a labour-saving machine for effecting the transport of goods more easily than it could be accomplished on the backs or in the hands of men. Between coin and barter, between the wheelbarrow and the mighty locomotive, what an enormous saving of labour has been effected in the exchange and in the transport of those commodities necessary for the use and convenience of man; yet notwithstanding this the demand for labour has increased a thousandfold. Wheelbarrows may have displaced porters who have hitherto transported goods on their backs, and locomotives may have rendered unnecessary the mail coaches and the carriers of a former day, but while these labour-saving machines have done this, they have done more: they have called into action the dormant activities of multitudes, and established thousands of industries which would have been absolutely impossible without their aid; and so it is with other forms of labour-saving machinery—the labour of some may be displaced, but the final result must be the calling into productive activity of still larger numbers of men. All that men require is freedom to adapt themselves to the new conditions which labour-saving machines are constantly bringing about.

Trades unionism also limits in an arbitrary manner the amount of work which its members shall do. Although to the superficial observer the easy and rapid production of wealth by labour-saving machines is the cause of unemployed men, the real cause lies deeper. The real cause is the exclusive possession by a few men of that which is the heritage of all the generations of men—the earth, on which we live, and move, and have our being. Remove this cause, and the more machines a man can work the more wealth he will produce, while his wages will be the full product of his labour. But so long as the earth, or a part of the earth, is owned and held by one man, no man, no number of men, can supply themselves.

Take the case of Lord Penrhyn. Some 5000 men, until the past few months, have found a means of livelihood in quarrying out slates from a mountain, which Lord Penrhyn is pleased (and is permitted by the laws of this country) to call his own. The men desire some slight amelioration in the conditions of their labour, Lord Penrhyn refuses, and shuts up the slate mountain; and Lord Penrhyn, by virtue of his privileged position, can absolutely command the destinies of these 5000 men. The production of wealth, therefore, to the extent of several thousands of pounds per week is absolutely stopped by the will of one man. Lord Penrhyn, being

able to determine production in this arbitrary way, is lord of trade ; for it is quite evident that every week there must be several thousands of pounds less demand in the market for those commodities which are the products of the labour of other men ; consequently, trade to this extent is paralysed. Lord Penrhyn, however, belongs to that class which we reserve for our highest honours, and instal in hereditary legislative chambers, which control the destinies of the people. Before him and his class labour bows in grovelling and superstitious terror. Why ? Because in the hollow of his hand he holds the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If a tax of even 10 per cent. were levied on the annual value of the natural opportunity which Lord Penrhyn holds, the Penrhyn strike would be settled, and settled on a sound and enduring basis, in less than a month. Lord Penrhyn could not possibly hold this great natural opportunity indefinitely idle and pay even this small tax.

A tax on land values would prove to be, in short, the key of the door of nature. When men have free access to nature (and who shall deny them this access unless he is prepared to show his title-deed to the exclusive possession of the earth from God Almighty ?) they can make as much wealth as they care to without hurting any one, and no man will work for another if he can make more by working for himself.

Another defect in trades unionism is that it is conservative in principle. It groups men in various rings with interests hostile to each other, and bitter demarcation disputes are, as a result, of frequent occurrence. These defects, like the others alluded to, are the products of a condition of tyranny, which will be speedily remedied when the real solution is truly apprehended.

Let us not deceive ourselves : we can only hope for a very slight and temporary amelioration of the condition of labour from trades unionism as it is to-day. I do not say that men should cease to be trades unionists ; in fact, I cannot see what else they can do under existing conditions. But if trades unionism makes mistakes and at times is tyrannous, employers' unionism is no better. Instead of getting to the root of the matter, the employers, like the men, are content to deal with superficial matters only, and they mix up cause and effect in the most hopeless manner. They are constantly groaning about an increase in wages, and the interference and dictation of union officials, but they accept as if Heaven had decreed them the ever-increasing exactions and interferences of the land monopoly that plunders them incessantly. Let the workmen be as unreasonable as they may, they, at least, give a good return for the wages they receive or business would come to a standstill. What, however, does the landlord, the owner of the natural opportunity, give to the employer ? Absolutely nothing that nature has not provided independent of him. The employers accept this extraordinary state of

affairs without protest. If the men are not as wise as they should be, neither are the employers, and before they severally exhaust themselves and paralyse trade in the idiotic endeavour to cripple each other, they should conjointly put a period to the exactions of that class which fattens on them both and which is of no more use to society than Dick Turpin was to the society of his day.

I could multiply examples indefinitely. Take one small example which was brought to my notice the other day. A manufacturing concern of moderate dimensions situated in the country, remote from town or village, leased a piece of ground and started business. Above the works, on a wild moorland worth little more than prairie value, there was a slight depression which, if dammed at one end, would form a convenient reservoir. The landlord agreed to let the manufacturer have the use of this ground, or rather the water which fell on it, for £50 per annum. The manufacturer built the necessary retaining walls and sluices, and laid the pipes to his works, some mile and a half distant. The works prospered, and lately the lease ran out. On the renewal of the lease the landlord raised the water rent from £50 to £300 per annum. This was the price for allowing that industry to continue—and he got it. The manufacturer did not go on strike against the landlord, or ask his fellow manufacturers to federate against such an exaction. Had the operatives made a demand for a 5 per cent. increase of their miserable wage, the machinery of the federation would in all probability have been requisitioned, and a ruinous strike provoked which might have paralysed the industry, but the land monopolist may increase his demands by 500 or 600 per cent., and against this privileged system of highwaymanry the employers as a class make no befitting protest.

Talk about the corrupt exactions of an oligarchic gang at Pretoria or anywhere else! What is this which is done everywhere daily, in the name of law and religion, and which we bow to as if it were the will of God? Surely the employers, so far as a proper knowledge of the basic principles which underlie all trade and industry are concerned, are quite as foolish as the men. When will trades unionism and employers' unionism alike turn their attention to the operations of that land monopoly which eventually swallows up the fruits, not only of the industry of private manufacturers and traders, but of productive and distributive co-operation?

The workers secure great benefits from organised co-operation, but they will only be allowed to enjoy these so long as the operation of co-operation is sectional. Let co-operation become general, and under existing conditions, the advantages will be transferred to the class which possesses absolute lordship over natural opportunities. In a word, should co-operation become general under existing economic conditions, the people would manage for themselves the work now

undertaken by the private trader, but the saving effected thereby would not go to the people; like all other public advantages it would be confiscated by the land monopolist and be registered in higher rent or land charges. As the owner of the wild moorland exacted toll from the private manufacturer, so the ground lords will increasingly exact tribute from the co-operators.

Take the case of the great productive works at Shieldhall. When these works were laid out, it was resolved that they should be model works of their kind. Grass lawns and flower beds were beautifully worked into the plan, while recreation- and dining-rooms for the managers and men were got up on a scale hitherto practically unknown in ordinary industrial concerns. "Away you academic dreamers who talk of basic principles! Away with your theorising and vain speculation! Give us the practical man or men who will take things as they are and make the best of them, and you will find that things are after all just as they should be! Behold Shieldhall!" Yes, behold it! Already they have commenced to build up their flower beds, already they are extending their buildings skywards; flowers, lawns, air, sunlight, skyline and recreation-rooms will go before long under sheer pressure of necessity if Shieldhall progresses. Why? Because they cannot get an acre of the idle land around them under £1500 per acre. When they went to Shieldhall a few years ago it was £500 per acre, and even that price was a swindle. Now, because they have done so well, the landowner demands £1500 per acre, and so they find it necessary to build up on the flower beds in the middle of the country. Co-operation, therefore, is as powerless as trades unionism or employers' unionism, as at present conducted, to deal with the dead hand of land monopoly or solve the labour problem.

What shall we say to these things, and what shall be our attitude? Are we to go on eternally, as at present, rolling up the hopeless hill of so-called social and political progress the stone of Sisyphus, or shall we assert our rights as men and demand our birth-right?

The rulers and leaders of public opinion are to-day loudly calling upon all to immolate themselves on the altar of sacrifice, as by this means alone can the social salvation of the masses be found. We must press our conquests abroad; we must find an outlet for our "surplus population"; when these things are achieved, the social elevation of the nation will have become an accomplished fact. It is the old trick exposed long ago by Shakespeare, when he caused Henry the Fourth to say to his son:

"I had a purpose once to lead out many to the Holy Land;
Lest rest and lying still should cause them to look too near unto
my state;
Therefore, my Harry, be it thy course .

To busy giddy minds with foreign quarrels,
So that action hence borne out may waste the memory of the
former days."

The old trick has been resurrected in the name of empire. We hear a great deal of empire in these days. It seems to be on everybody's tongue. Monarchs, Ministers of State, dukes, earls, lords, members of Parliament, lord mayors, lord provosts, bailies, aldermen, councillors, presidents of chambers of commerce, learned professors, ministers of religion, from the humble street preacher to the Pope of Rome, politicians and stump orators of all shades, and very shady some of them, men of rank and men of no rank; in fact, from the occupant of the throne to the ragged newsboy on the street, empire is the one-and-all-absorbing theme. Feeling has run high, very high, on this question of empire, and yet amid all this Niagara of talk, and inflammation of feeling, I have not met two men who could give an intelligent definition of what empire really is. Even one man may have many definitions. Take Lord Rosebery as an example. Lately he was in our midst delivering his Rectorial Address to the students of Glasgow University. Speaking of empire he says: "If any word can be invented, which as adequately expresses a number of states of vast size under a single sovereign, I would gladly consider it." Evidently this is one of Lord Rosebery's definitions—"a number of states of vast size under a single sovereign." If Lord Rosebery had stopped there, we might have reasonably concluded that the definition was about as good as any we could possibly get, and in discussing the matter under such a definition we should have been able at least to make some progress towards an intelligent conclusion. Immediately, however, he proceeds to say: "And in the meantime the word empire represents to us *our history, our tradition, our race*. It is a *matter of influence, of peace, of commerce, of civilisation*, above all a question of *faith*, but it is also a *matter of business, a practical affair*. You have received from your forefathers this great appanage; no one outside an asylum wishes to be rid of it."

The inmates of asylums have always had our sincerest sympathy, but it would seem on the authority of Lord Rosebery that this is quite uncalled for.

Again he asks: "What is this empire?" and answering himself, continues—"The last calculations seems to be this, that *its area is between eleven and twelve million square miles*." Then he proceeds to say: "It is already beyond comprehension," and adds that "but for a small incident this empire might have been incalculably greater." Finally, so far as his definitions go, he says: "And what is empire but '*predominance of race*'?"

Let us recapitulate in the sequence that Lord Rosebery observed in his Rectorial Address his definitions of empire:

- 1st. A number of states of vast size under a single sovereign.
- 2nd. Our history.
- 3rd. Our race.
- 4th. A matter of influence.
- 5th. " " peace.
- 6th. " " commerce.
- 7th. " " civilisation.
- 8th. Above all a question of faith.
- 9th. A matter of business.
- 10th. A practical affair.
- 11th. Its area is between eleven and twelve millions of square miles.
- 12th. Predominance of race.

Now, how an empire could be one and all of these things at the same time puzzles me. It has puzzled a good many smarter men, and perhaps it accounts for the extraordinary discussions let loose on the subject.

Lord Rosebery says we have received this "great appanage" from our forefathers. Perhaps this accounts for the yearning we have at times for our forefathers, so that we might kick some of them. It comes over us in waves when it is peremptorily demanded that we shall take our houses for twelve or eighteen months, although next month, or next week for that matter, we may be heaven knows where. We don't seem to think then that this extraordinary legacy amounts to much. Or when we go a-prospecting for a mere rood of these "twelve millions of square miles" for a garden, a house, or a factory, and find that it is in the hands of the trust lawyers or speculators, and that our only legacy is to "pay! pay! pay!" we feel in spite of all the tall talk of "heritage" and the glowing periods of Rectorial rhetoric that our forefathers have swindled us. When we walk over a wild moorland, or attempt to fish in a loch or river of this glorious appanage, and an armed man reinforced with sleuth hounds orders us on to the highway, on pain of prison, fine, or personal violence—well, we—we feel that if this is what our forefathers bequeathed to us, we wish we never had forefathers, or having them that they had lived long enough for us to rid ourselves of them.

When we reflect that in the very heart of this "great appanage," in London, close upon a million beneficiaries under the will live in crowded conditions worse than beasts, and that 80,000 women on an average nightly have no place to lay their heads, that in our Glasgow 439,000 out of 700,000 live in one-roomed or two-roomed tenements, and that all our large towns and cities have a similar proportion of squalor, suffering, and disease, if we have the hearts of men we must refuse to rejoice at such a heritage; and, finally, when we see, as happened but a day or two ago, some thousands of poor old sandwich men entertained at a charity dinner, and discover that

some nine-tenths of these had served their Queen and empire—that is to say, they did the murdering part of the work, we are driven to the conclusion that not only did our forefathers swindle us in their legacy, but that they who seek to perpetuate this state of affairs are swindlers in the councils of the people.

We bow our heads to the inevitable; the swindlers, for a time at least, have triumphed. To thoughtful men it grows clearer every day that this empire craze is but a "holy alliance" of the aristocracy up to date. The people have in their minds one empire, the rulers have another in theirs. The people's empire is one in which every noble impulse will have scope to grow. The ruler's empire is but an extension of the conditions which prevail here—a huge scheme of class aggrandisement, where the many are called to toil and sacrifice continually that a few may obtain exclusive possession of the opportunities of life and labour—the earth. We have no objection to a people's empire, that is, an empire where all men shall have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—an empire where the sordid and degraded struggle for the mere necessities of life such as we now experience shall be unknown; an empire where those who labour shall enjoy the full fruits of their labour; an empire where each and every man shall stand erect, looking into the face of his fellow men and speaking the thought he would lovingly yet fearlessly; an empire of true freedom, the bonds of which are neither dominion nor conquest, but mutual trust and brotherhood and equality of opportunity; an empire founded on justice, and exalted as only a nation or empire can be exalted—by righteousness; "an empire where no man shall beg of another man the right to toil."

Lord Rosebery's empire, no matter how he seeks to conceal it, is an empire based on force, an empire of military dominion; his confusing definitions are merely resorted to so that the ignorant and thoughtless may be enlisted to support a scheme which has for its primary object not the subjugation of alien peoples alone, but the subjugation of the very people who are foolish enough to toil and sacrifice in building it up. To realise a Roseberian empire it is necessary to create a strong public sentiment of national and race superiority. The two most powerful agencies for moulding popular thought are requisitioned for the propaganda, the press and the pulpit, and in due time the whole of society is infected with the deadly poison, until even the most degraded victims of misrule here are shouting for that misrule to be extended to territories where a freer and a wider life is possible. We are a peculiar people, a holy people, an imperial and conquering race, and under God it is our bounden duty to go forth and slay and subjugate the peoples who fail to be impressed with either our holiness or our institutions!

The conditions and the institutions of the peoples we are invoked

to make war upon are misrepresented. A portion of the truth may be told, but the remainder of the truth is judiciously suppressed, just as with reference to our own affairs great poets or authors are quoted with a flagrant and shameless ignoring of the context. Lord Rosebery asks us to remember how incomparably Shakespeare described the seat of empire :

"This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself,
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy brood of men—this little world—
This precious stone set in the silver sea.

* * * *

This blessed spot, this earth, this realm, this England."

To stop the quotation here is to misrepresent Shakespeare, and to misrepresent him for a purpose. Shakespeare causes John of Gaunt to describe in these words an England which he has known, but which had passed away. Here is the conclusion of John of Gaunt's speech so conveniently left out by Lord Rosebery. Let me as conveniently put it in :

"This land of such dear souls, this dear dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leased out—I die pronouncing it—
Like to a tenement, or peddling farm,
England, bound in by the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame,
With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds:
That England which was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself,
Ah, would the scandal vanish with my life,
How happy then were my ensuing death."

This is the England and the empire which Lord Rosebery and his class are seeking to extend and perpetuate, an empire "bound in with shame, with inky blots and rotten parchment bonds."

They have succeeded from the time of John of Gaunt until now. It is for the people of "this dear dear land" to say whether the classes shall continue to deceive them longer. Such an empire as these men conceive cannot last; Salisburian rifle clubs and "burghers of the Queen" will be as impotent to save it as the sneering and inflated impudence of a Chamberlain is to lend it dignity. Such an empire means the increasing enslavement of the workers, their concentration and degradation in cities and towns which are but an aggregation of pest houses in the East End and of unbridled luxury and wantonness in the West, while the country, God's own country, our heritage, is held up for speculation or for the selfish

pleasure of the few, who with loud mouths call us to sacrifice ourselves to obtain open doors for trade abroad, while they shut hard upon us the only door to life and trade at home—the land.

A thousand city men—operatives, clerks, and tradesmen—volunteer in a crisis, to serve what they, with the best intentions, think their country; only one hundred of these on examination are found to be physically fit. What does this mean? It means that not from without, but from within, are the forces which shall compass our destruction.

I have pointed out the forces which are robbing us continually of the fruits of our labour and of all the benefits of social, moral, and material progress. The chief defenders of this condition of things are the chief exponents of empire—Salisburian empire, Chamberlain empire, and Roseberian empire; they fatten on us to the extent of £200,000,000 or £300,000,000 per annum in land charges:

“They know no interest but their own,
They shake the State, they shake the throne,
They shake the world, and God alone
Seems safe in his Omnipotence.”

But there are not wanting signs that the people, the sovereign people, are at least beginning to understand the game. They have fought and bled and paid for empire, and now they wish to enjoy some of it. The value of empire is the value of territory, or land value; this for some hundreds of years has been the appanage of a class, not the appanage of the people, as Lord Rosebery would make us believe. The taxation of land values, opposed by the privileged classes and the speculators, will, in the early future, if the people slumber not, secure empire to all who work for it.

When territory is no longer private property, then, but not till then, shall we have a real empire where labour “meets delight half way,” and where every noble impulse shall have scope to grow.

For such an empire who could not be relied upon absolutely to make every sacrifice? But as for a Roseberian empire, based on twelve more or less mutually exclusive or destructive definitions, who but the unwise could support it?

WM. D. HAMILTON.

TENANCY LAW IN NORTH-WESTERN INDIA.

FIFTEEN months ago the North-Western Provinces and Oudh Legislative Council passed into law a Bill having for its object the protection of the hereditary estates of the Taluqdars, or Barons, of Oudh from disintegration; not, as in the more recent Punjab Land Alienation Act, by taking from the owners freedom of contract, but by giving them statutory power to relinquish that right by voluntary notification of settlement on their heirs in perpetuity of all property in which they have a permanent, heritable, and transferable right. The measure—probably on account of its purely permissive character—was received with approval by those whom it chiefly affected, but the reverse has been the case in respect to a Bill since introduced into the same Council with the object of dealing with a different phase of agrarian economy—that of the relations between landlord and tenant—in the other portion of Sir Antony MacDonnell's jurisdiction, the North-Western Provinces. The strong repugnance shown towards the latter Bill by the zamindars (as the landlords of the North-Western Provinces are called) has found expression in a number of memorials and representations to Government, the most noteworthy of these being a petition from some two thousand landlords, representing property valued at no less than 150 millions sterling, praying the Viceroy to refuse to sanction the introduction of the measure. The Indian Government had only a few weeks previously shown their confidence in the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces by recommending the Secretary of State to extend by twelve months Sir Antony's term of office, and after inviting him to Simla to discuss the subject with him there, Lord Curzon decided to allow the Bill, with some modifications, to be introduced, subject to the sanction (subsequently obtained with further modifications) of the Secretary of State, and it was accordingly laid before the Legislative Council at Allahabad in November last.

Lord Curzon justly observed last year, in reference to a Bill abandoned in response to adverse criticism, that in proportion as the legislative machinery in India is dominated by the official element, and is free from the checks and delays which attach to it in

countries whose Parliaments are mainly or wholly representative or hereditary, its operations should be made deliberate and painstaking. The bitterest opponents of the North-Western Provinces Tenancy Bill, must at least admit that in regard to it this principle has been carefully adhered to. About two years ago a tentative Bill was issued in order to invite and focus the opinions of persons interested. A second followed, and after it had been discussed with landowners and Government officers, the whole Rent Act was re-drafted in the light of the suggestions made, and the Bill became a consolidating measure. It was not until the landowners had again been invited to confer, by means of a small committee, with the Lieutenant-Governor, and a few further changes had in consequence been made, that a fourth and final draft was submitted to the Government of India for sanction. The care thus taken to ascertain the views of the zamindars has not, however, removed their hostility to the Bill, for although their wishes have been met in regard to certain details in whole or in part, Sir Antony MacDonnell has been careful to adhere throughout to the principal features of the measure, and to these the landlords are still strongly opposed.

The existing rent law of the North-Western Provinces has been in force with but little real change since 1859, when it was included in the famous Bengal Act, which was designed to protect the tenant in his holding and to regulate rents. It made twelve years' continuous occupancy the test of the right of fixity of tenure, and the courts held when litigation for the establishment of the right ensued that the claim could only be sustained when the tenant could prove continuous occupation for that period of the same plot. The landlords have thus, to quote the words of the Duke of Devonshire when, as Lord Hartington, he was Secretary for India in the Liberal Ministry of 1880-5, been enabled "to prevent the tenant from acquiring the right either by shifting his fields within the twelve years, by inducing him to enter into a written contract barring the right, or merely destroying his evidence of continuous possession." More frequently the occupier is ejected one day only to be re-admitted the next, thus nominally creating a breach in the continuity of the holding. That these practices have not been very largely resorted to in the North-Western Provinces, however, seems clearly established from the fact that in the four decades that have followed the passing of the Act two-thirds of the holdings therein have become occupancy tenancies. During the past fifteen years, however, an increasing tendency has been shown by the zamindars to bar the accrual of occupancy rights, and the ratio at which they had previously been acquired has diminished to a degree not wholly explainable by the operation of mathematical laws.

Sir Antony MacDonnell himself attributes the growth of this attitude to legislation which he was mainly instrumental in placing on the Statute Book for Bengal in 1885. Twelve years earlier the

North-Western Provinces had obtained a separate Act, with a view of meeting the differences in the conditions of their land tenures and those of Bengal, and in 1881 an amending Bill was passed, but neither measure greatly affected the principles adopted two years after the Mutiny, or the details of their application. In Bengal the antagonism between landlord and tenant on the question of occupancy right was much more pronounced than in the North-Western Provinces, and in the Act of 1885, what its foremost advocate, Sir Antony MacDonnell, calls "a drastic solution" was found by legalising the conception of the "settled ryot" entitled to occupancy rights as "a person who continuously for twelve years cultivates land in a village—not necessarily the same land and not necessarily under the same landlord," and every "settled ryot" of a village who acquires land for purposes of cultivation holds it from the outset on an occupancy title.

In the Bill now before the local Legislature Sir Antony proposes to introduce a similar, though not identical, remedy for a state of things in the North-Western Provinces, which, while it has existed for forty-two years and was not handled on the two former occasions when the law of landlord and tenant was revised, has assumed somewhat large proportions since, in the teeth of much opposition, the "drastic solution" was applied to Bengal. The Bill provides that so long as a tenant holds land under the same owner, the accrual of occupancy rights shall not be defeated merely by a change in the holding, and that whatever land the tenant may occupy at the end of the twelfth year will thereafter be retained by him and his heirs or relatives or co-sharers to whom he may transfer the occupancy right. The Bill does not take away the power of the owner to eject to bar the accrual of rights: it simply provides that it must be an ejectment not merely from a particular plot, but from the entire estate, and that a minimum period of twelve months must elapse before the evicted tenant is re-admitted if the former tenancy is not to count towards the establishment of fixity. As these provisions are retrospective, and as a clause has been inserted rendering invalid any contract or agreement contrary to its provisions on or after April 1, 1900 (although the Bill will not reach the desired haven of the Statute Book until next autumn at best), the immediate effect of its passing will be to raise a large number of tenants-at-will to the status of tenants with occupancy rights. The accrual of these rights is at present barred by leaseholds, but the procedure laid down for the grant of these deeds is too elaborate to suit the unlettered peasantry, and it is only on large estates managed by considerate and intelligent landowners that they have been freely resorted to. The present Bill recognises leases of any duration, but provides that they cannot operate against the accrual of tenant right unless they are for a period of seven years or upwards.

It need scarcely be said that in India, 'as in other countries, the question of tenant right is closely connected with that of fair rent. The growth of population under the *Pax Britannica* increases the demand for land in fertile and populous tracts, and with that increase rents tend to rise. The Bill does not propose in the case of tenants-at-will to interfere in rents agreed to by both parties, except that when a contract has been made for enhancement of rent the occupier is to be entitled to remain on his holding not less than five years at the same rental, the period counting towards the twelve years necessary to acquire permanent rights. In the case of disputed enhancements, if the demand exceeds one anna in the rupee additional the tenant can, on a suit brought by the landlord for ejectment, apply to have a fair rent fixed by the Court, and when that is done he will have a "statutory holding" for seven years (not counting towards occupancy rights) at the rent fixed. At the end of the septennial period the same conditions will recur. Government are of opinion that by this arrangement a premium will be placed on keeping out of Court, and an inducement held out to landlords to be content with moderate enhancements. The Bill carefully regulates the circumstances under which the rent of occupancy tenants may be enhanced or abated by registered contract or agreement, or by order of the Court, such changes only to be made after intervals of ten years or more, except under suits on certain specified grounds. It is satisfactory to note that it is not to these sections of the Bill that the zamindars are opposed, and that while certain of their details are deemed unfair they are accepted, especially by the more intelligent landowners, as imposing only reasonable restrictions on rent enhancements. As in the North-Western Provinces the land revenue is regulated by the rent received by the assesses thereto, it follows that Government in limiting the right of enhancement is putting corresponding restrictions upon the growth of its own receipts from taxation.

It may be safely asserted that in no country more than in India, with its ignorant improvident people and its rapacious money-lenders, are the benevolent intentions of the Legislature more often and more sadly defeated. The benefits anticipated to accrue to the cultivators from placing within their reach the "haven of fixity" have been largely neutralised by the want of adequate limitations on the power of transfer of the right. Nominally this power cannot be exercised except within certain narrow limits. But the Courts have ruled that the occupancy tenant can grant sub-leases of his holding in perpetuity, and also that during the term of such sub-lease he cannot relinquish his occupancy title to the landlord. Consequently the right of fixity has been treated very much as if it were a commodity that could be sold or mortgaged, and has been utilised as security for the debts which the Indian villager is so prone to contract for family ceremonies and other purposes. The custom is for

the cultivator to lease his occupancy land to the money-lender, giving him the power to sub-let provided he pays the rent regularly to the landlord. He then takes back the holding as a sub-tenant of his own sub-lessee, at a rent very much higher than the latter pays to the owner, and degenerates into a mere serf of the money-lender. In other cases the occupancy tenant makes himself into a sort of under-proprietor, by sub-letting and subsisting on the difference between his own moderate rent and that he extorts from the actual tillers of the soil. Thus, as the Hon. Mr. Miller said in introducing the Bill, the fixity of tenure sanctioned by the law becomes a mere instrument for the creation of a class of middlemen and the transfer to the money-lender of a valuable interest in the land: "The landlord loses and the tenant does not gain." The limitation of sub-leasing has, however, to be cautiously carried out, to prevent hardship in the case of tenants who are prevented by reasonable causes from cultivating their holdings themselves. The difficulty is sought to be met in the Bill by allowing females, minors, and others to sub-let, but prohibiting sub-leases in other cases should their term exceed three years. The landowners regard this as a very inadequate remedy for the evils referred to, especially when considered in connection with Section 22, which enables the tenant to transfer his occupancy right to any member of his family, no matter of how distant a branch.

It is, however, to the provisions made in the Bill for automatically and retrospectively increasing the number of occupancy tenures that the zamindars are most antagonistic. They urge that the analogy with Bengal, where Sir Antony MacDonnell carried similar provisions into law in 1885, is entirely vitiated by the existence there of the Permanent Settlement, under which the landowners' incomes have increased eighty-fold within three generations, although the Government demand from them has remained the same. Hence while the landlords of the North-Western Provinces pay at least half of their rentals to Government, those of Behar only pay from 12 to 14 per cent. The protection regarded as necessary where the settlement of the Government demand is fixed is not, they contend, called for in a part of the country where the respective status of landlord and tenant undergoes a careful and detailed scrutiny at the hands of high Government officials every thirty years. They read into the official declarations of more than a century ago the promise to extend the Permanent Settlement to the North-Western Provinces, and as this has never been fulfilled they ask that they may at least be left in possession of the few privileges that are in their view threatened by the Bill—privileges which are insignificant compared with the lightness of assessment to land revenue enjoyed by their Bengal contemporaries. They recall the opinion expressed by no less an authority than Sir William Muir, when Lieutenant-Governor

of the North-Western Provinces in 1863, that "the conversion of . . . long occupation into the sharply-drawn prescription of twelve years is now generally felt, in the light of subsequent experience, to infringe unduly and unnecessarily the rights of the proprietor and to be open to objection on other grounds." The principle of twelve years' occupancy securing tenant-right has, however, been too long in existence for any serious attempt to obtain its abrogation to be made; but the landowners hold that no adequate grounds are forthcoming for legislation to facilitate the acquirement of fixity of tenure by methods which they regard as inimical to friendly relations between their tenants and themselves, as opening the door to a vast amount of litigation, and as prejudicial to the true interests of both sections of the agricultural interest. They point to the fact that in the Central Provinces similar legislation (for which, singularly enough, Sir A. MacDonnell was also chiefly responsible) has proved so unsatisfactory that it has lately undergone considerable modification at the hands of the Viceregal Legislative Council. Again quoting Sir William Muir and other authorities, they contend that the right of fixity was instituted after the Mutiny to protect the old hereditary tenant, and not with any idea of all tenants automatically acquiring the right. It is true that many landlords have neglected the precautions the law recognises for retaining control over the disposal of their land, owing partly to the complicated nature of the requisite procedure and partly to the inertia common to Orientals; hence the right of occupancy has become so widely diffused that it is now, incorrectly as the zamindars contend, looked upon in many quarters as the eventual and satisfactory status of all tenancies. Since the passing of the Bengal Act sixteen years ago the landowners, anticipating the extension of its principles to the North-Western Provinces, have more largely availed themselves of the protection recognised by the law, and they have also in some instances adopted the simple expedient of creating a temporary and nominal break in the tenant's holding once in twelve years—an evasion of the spirit of the law which cannot be commended, but which has caused little or no inconvenience or hardship to the cultivators affected. By making the dispossession to bar accrual of right a minimum one of twelve months, the Bill will, on the other hand, cause much trouble to the tenants, for the zamindars announce their determination not to allow even the risk of land being unoccupied for a year to stand in the way of the conservation of their power to let the land in regard to which fixity has not accrued to whom they will. They believe this power (of course under due limitations) is essential to the retention of the prestige and influence they have with the cultivators, and which in times of popular excitement have frequently been of signal benefit to the State. As to the advantages the tenants are intended to receive, in the opinion even of Government officers of experience it is the shift,

careless and dishonest who will most benefit by a law providing him with numerous loopholes of escape from just demands, in prosecution of which landowners will find their hands tied at every turn. The proposal to bar accrual of fixity by septennial leases is welcomed by the landowners, but they foresee that the tenantry, who have never taken kindly to such agreements, will be still less in favour of them when they know that they stand in the way of what is in practice (and will still be) a negotiable asset, on which money can be borrowed. The endeavours of the landlords to induce the tenants to take leases are therefore bound to create ill-feeling between the parties. The retrospective character of this legislation, and its grant of occupancy right in all land held by the tenant at the close of the twelfth year, no matter how recently he may have acquired portions of it, are especially denounced as arbitrary methods of depriving the landlords of cherished rights.

As editor of an Anglo-Indian daily paper circulating in the Provinces concerned, I have carefully studied this somewhat complicated problem, and have heard the opposing views upon it at first hand. Without being committed to an entire acceptance of the opinions of the zamindars, I share their regret that the provisions of the Bill are so out of harmony with the official declaration of the "Statement of Objects and Reasons," to the effect that "it is not the wish of this Government to deprive landowners of effective control over the growth of occupancy rights." The zamindars not unnaturally ask that, in view of this declaration, the sections for forcing on occupancy rights, with their uncertain benefits to the tenants, should be abandoned, and, as a *quid pro quo*, fixity of tenure for a period of, say, five years at a fixed rent, should be insisted on. This would do away entirely with yearly tenancies, and, by obviating the long-standing struggle for and against the securement of heritable fixity, would reduce to a minimum the litigation to which the cultivators are increasingly prone and which is bound to flourish under the Bill as it stands. The measure is now under the consideration of a Select Committee of the Legislature, and it may be hoped that some such compromise will be arrived at by that body, which should find no great difficulty in retaining the essential principle of the Bill—reasonable security to the tenant in his holding—by other methods than those to which the landlords are so strongly opposed, and which they believe will strain to breaking-point the patriarchal relations between them and their tenants. It is because the possibility of so grave a calamity as that being induced by the Bill should not pass unheeded at home that I have brought before the readers of this REVIEW, though with all possible brevity, the necessarily technical details of the points at issue between Sir Antony MacDonnell and the zamindars of the North-Western Provinces.

F. H. BROWN.

REGISTRATION REFORM AND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE.

ON June 3, 1780, in the House of Lords :

"The order for the day being read, the Duke of Richmond presented to the House a Bill entitled, 'An Act for declaring and restoring the natural, inalienable, and equal right of all the Commons of Great Britain (infants, persons of insane mind, and criminals incapacitated by law only excepted) to vote in the election of their representatives to Parliament; for regulating the mode and manner of such election; for restoring annual Parliaments; for giving an hereditary seat to the sixteen Peers which shall be elected for Scotland, and for establishing more equitable regulations concerning the peerage of Scotland.'

"The following were the heads of the Bill: The Parliaments in future to last but one year; the number of members to continue as at present, at 558; every man born a subject of Great Britain to be entitled to a vote at the age of twenty-one years; a list to be taken in every parish of the numbers of men of that description, and returns to be made of them to the Lord Chancellor; the numbers to be totalled up and divided by 558, and then the quotient to be the number by which one member of Parliament is to be elected; every county to be divided into as many districts as they contain quotients of this nature, and these districts to be called boroughs; Scottish peerages."

Whether the Duke of Richmond intended by the "Commons of Great Britain" the whole body of adult men and women in England and Scotland does not appear, nor whether the word man was intended to include women. It is interesting, however, to remember that, so late as 1648, various Puritan women tendered their votes in the county [of Suffolk, which were allowed by the clerks, but disallowed by the High Sheriff, Sir Simon d'Ewes, who says himself:

"It is true that by the ignorance of some of the Clarkes at the other two tables, the oaths of some single women that were freeholders were taken without the knowledge of the said High Sheriff, who as soone as he had notice thereof instantly sent to forbidd the same, conceiving it a matter verie unworthie of any gentleman, and most dishonorable in such an election, to make use of their voices, *although in law they might have been allowed*. Nor did the High Sheriff allow of the said votes, upon his numbering of the said Poll, but with the allowance and consent of the said two Knights themselves, discount them and cast them out."

Private personal opinion and feeling here, as in many cases affecting women, overruled admitted legal rights.

In the course of the brief debate which followed the presentment of the Duke of Richmond's Reform Bill, Lord Stormont said :

"A late friend both of his Grace and his, the President de Montesquieu, had said of the British Constitution that it surpassed all that had ever been thought of by the wisest philosophers in the wisest times. We know what it is now, observed his lordship, but shall we be able to say what it may be if we attempt reforms?"

The Bill was read a first time, but thrown out without a division.¹

Forty-one years later, the Prime Minister of the day, Lord Liverpool, wrote :

"The grant of representation to the large boroughs would be the greatest evil conferred on those towns: it would subject the population to a perpetual factious canvass, which would divert, more or less, the people from their industrious habits, and keep alive a permanent spirit of turbulence and disaffection among them. . . . I do not wish to see more such boroughs as Westminster, Southwark, Nottingham, &c."

This is the time of which it was written :

"The dust of Old Sarum is holy :
In our hearts live her ramparts and towers :
No progress : improvement is folly ;
'The cause of Green Gattou is ours."

These were the days when rotten boroughs, close corporations, and corrupt constituencies had the support of overwhelming majorities in both Houses of Parliament. In the counties the franchise was restricted to the forty-shilling freeholder, where indeed the election was not settled quietly by a select conclave at the house of the magnate of the district. In the boroughs, mainly the creation of royal caprice or favour, the franchise was dependent upon charters, local usage, or some special (local) Act of Parliament. In some cases a close corporation, perpetually self-elected, was the sole electorate. Four thousand "freemen and inhabitants" of Lancaster returned two members, whilst forty-three freemen at Dartmouth, fifty-nine "freeholders" at Reigate, and a corporation of thirty-one persons at Thetford, enjoyed the same privilege. Meanwhile Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, and other rapidly growing centres of industry had no Parliamentary representation. In Scotland the position, both as to boroughs and counties, was even worse. Though the world moves slowly, yet it does move—is the first thought of even the most pessimistic amongst us, when we pause and look back. Seats in the House of Commons can no longer be bought and sold like tickets for the opera. No self-elected corporation can now monopolise the representation of a great city. The qualified, registered, electors of the three kingdoms now number nearly seven

¹ *Hansard's Parliamentary History*, vol. xxi. p. 686.

millions.¹ Yet nearly half the electorate at the last election either could not or did not care to vote—whilst women are perforce kept outside the body politic, outlanders in their native land. Are the old foes alive and active now, though with new faces, and is sex privilege—the subtlest and most cruel of all forms of privilege—to be the ultimate stage of a decadent, though boastful, humanity, or are we on the verge of even greater reforms than those of the nineteenth century; reforms which shall utilise for the good of all the now terribly wasted resources of civic energy—and shall set free the highest forces of the race for the uplifting of all humanity? Much will depend on the sense of justice in men, but even more on the resolution of women themselves to claim and take their rightful place in the service of the race.

The existing law of franchises and of registration is the fearful and wonderful result of some thirty or forty separate Acts of Parliament, and of various Orders in Council, complicated by multitudinous rulings of revising barristers, and by various judicial decisions, which in cases affecting women appear, to such women at least as have carefully examined them, more marked by judicial sex-bias and prejudice than by legal acumen or consistency of thought.

The study of the many Acts of Parliament which, beginning with the Reform Act of 1832, have shaped the existing law on these matters, is of considerable historical interest, but would involve too many cumbersome technicalities and too much wearisome repetition and qualification to suit a popular treatment of the subject, which must give results rather than processes. The impression left on the mind of the student is, moreover, mainly a conviction that our legislators seldom, if ever, looked either before or after, or had any clearly defined notion of whither they were drifting.

The general results may, however, be broadly summed up, with the necessary comments.

And first, as to disqualified persons. These are (1) aliens, not being naturalised British subjects. (2) Persons who have received parish relief within twelve months. On this it should be remarked that *medical* relief does not disqualify; so that a man does not lose his vote if the parish doctor orders him some wine for his sick wife or some mutton for his sick self, though the receipt of a loaf of bread from the relieving-officer would deprive him of it. (3) Persons who have received alms from charities. Neither in this case nor in the previous one ought simple poverty to deprive any person of civic rights. Only that poverty can be dishonourable which is the result of evil conduct, and in this country it is by no means the people who have naught who are the "naughtiest." (4) Persons under sentence of imprisonment. It has been decided under this

¹ The register of 1900 showed a total of 6,732,613 Parliamentary electors, exclusively males.

head that a "ticket-of-leave" man cannot exercise either the parliamentary or municipal franchise until his full term of punishment had expired, or he had received a free pardon. It is probably remembered by but few persons that on June 13, 1884, when the Representation of the People Act was under consideration, an amendment which would have extended by twelve months more the disqualification of a male felon was brought forward and *rejected*. The previous day, June 12, an amendment which would have effected the enfranchisement of women was, at the instigation of Mr. Gladstone, rejected by a vote of two to one in a House of nearly four hundred. The House, in its wisdom, held that a year's additional electoral incapacity was too severe a penalty for the worst *male* felon, but did not regard life-long incapacity as too severe a punishment for the crime of being a woman. (5) Persons convicted under the Corrupt Practices Act.

Secondly, as to persons qualified to exercise the Parliamentary franchise. These have been held, since the decision of the Court of Common Pleas, in 1868, in the famous case of *Chorlton v. Lings*, to be males only; although it has been usually held that, if a woman's name found its way to the Parliamentary Register, she was entitled to record her vote, and a few women have, I believe, thus voted in each General Election since that date. In the election of 1900 the votes of such women were accepted in some places and rejected in others, according to the judgment of the local returning officer.

The qualified males include (1) owners, who numbered in 1900, in the three kingdoms, 557,242. These are county electors; and, as residence is not essential to an ownership vote, a male person owning property in several constituencies may have a vote for each of these constituencies. (2) Inhabitant householders, whether rated directly or indirectly, including caretakers and service occupations. Here it must be noted that in Ireland *direct* rating has been recently made essential to the qualification, with the result of disfranchising large numbers of voters in Waterford and elsewhere. How this would work in England may be gathered from the fact that in the *parish* of Birmingham, which is a parish within the parliamentary borough of Birmingham, about 40,000 of the voters belong to the "compound" householder class, who do not pay their rates personally. It should be noted, moreover, that though a householder removing from one house to another does not lose his qualification, a lodger who becomes a householder, or a householder who becomes a lodger is, for a time, disqualified. Moreover, should a man let his house for more than four consecutive months he will lose his vote, unless he takes care to sleep in the house once each four months, in which case he will not lose his vote though he let the house the whole year round. A manager, caretaker, or other servant living in a

house is entitled to the franchise, provided his employer does not reside in the house; but by giving his employer a night's shelter he might lose his vote.

(3) Occupiers of £10 clear annual value and upwards, whether directly rated or not. These are users of offices, warehouses, shops, &c., not being householders.

(4) Lodgers. Every person of full age who has occupied and resided in the same lodgings *for twelve months*, of the clear unfurnished value of £10 annually, is entitled to claim to be registered and to vote. He need not be rated, but he must renew his claim year by year. Moreover, if he changes his lodgings he loses his qualification till twelve months' continuous residence has again secured him a new one. Two lodgers, occupying lodgings in common on the same conditions, may each claim to be registered and to vote, if the clear unfurnished value of the apartments amounts to £10 a year for each of them.

(5) The old franchises, freemen and freeholders, reserved by the Reform Act of 1832.

(6) University electors, who in 1900 numbered 41,503 in the three kingdoms. They return nine members.

SCHOOL BOARD FRANCHISE.

This includes men and women. In boroughs: the burgesses. In parishes outside boroughs: the ratepayers. In London: parochial electors, except in the City of London. With regard to the School Board franchise, it must be remembered that each elector is entitled to as many votes as there are members to be elected, and may distribute these votes at pleasure. In the *City* of London women have not yet established their right to vote.

MUNICIPAL FRANCHISE.

All ratepayers, men or women, on the Burgess Roll. For the new London Borough Councils and the London County Council the electoral qualification is wider than that for any other Borough or County Council in England and Wales, being simply that of being a "parochial elector." Thus, qualified married women, male lodgers, and male holders of the service franchise may vote for the London County and Borough Councils, but for no other Borough or County Councils in England and Wales.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (COUNTY COUNCIL) FRANCHISE.

Men and single women who are owners or occupiers.

PAROCHIAL FRANCHISE.

Those entitled to vote for the election of Boards of Guardians, Urban District Councils, Rural District Councils, and Parish Councils are (1) Men and women, being inhabitant householders, whether rated directly or not; (2) and further, in the case of men, lodgers, caretakers, and service occupiers, as well as owners, resident, or non-resident. It must here be observed that though married women were expressly made competent electors by the Local Government (England and Wales) Act of 1894, the fact that in England and Wales, outside London, married women have not yet been admitted as County Council electors, and can therefore only vote as occupiers, reduces greatly the possible number of qualified married women. A woman, living with her husband, can seldom secure a qualification, unless she be the personally rated owner, or the occupier, personally paying rent and rates, of the house in which they jointly live. In Ireland, it should be further noted, women voters, married and unmarried alike, may become qualified electors on precisely the same terms as men, that is, on the occupancy, ownership, lodger, or service qualification; and that on any of these qualifications women, whether married or not, may vote, not only for Urban and Rural District Councils, Boards of Guardians, and Town Commissioners, but also for Town and County Councils. In Scotland the qualified married woman, as well as her unmarried sister, may vote for Borough and County Councils, and in London for the Borough Councils or the County Council. It is now only in England and Wales (outside London) of the three kingdoms, that married women are still held in the inferior position declared to be theirs by the decision in *Regina v. Hurrell*. It is also noteworthy that some revising barristers appear to be taking the extra-legal and high-handed course of striking the married Englishwoman's name off the register, unless, like the lodger, she renews year by year her claim for registration.

With all these, and many other, foolish and vexatious differences and divergences, it is little wonder that overseers and others concerned find the task of preparing the electoral lists in any of our large centres of population almost overwhelming; the more so as these lists have to be published on July 31, while the twelve months' qualifying period only ends on July 15. In the parish of Birmingham, for example, the overseers find it necessary to prepare no fewer than seven draft lists, comprising

- (a) Men entitled to vote at all elections.
- (b) Men qualified by service franchise to vote at parliamentary and parochial elections only.
- (c) Burgesses, men and single women, entitled to vote at municipal and parochial elections only.
- (d) Married women entitled to vote at parochial elections only, under Local Government (England and Wales) Act, 1894.

(e) Men entitled by ownership of freehold property of the value of 40s., admitted by the Act of 1894 as parochial electors only.

(f) Men non-resident, occupiers within the parish, living beyond seven but within fifteen miles of the city boundary, qualified to be elected as aldermen or councillors, but not entitled to vote at any election.

(g) The old lodgers' list of re-claimers sent in to July 25, entitled to be enrolled as parliamentary electors.

So long as the divergence between the Parliamentary voter and the various classes of local voter is maintained, enormous waste of labour is inevitable, and the consequent confusion must with equal certainty lead to frequent injustice. A partial remedy for this waste of labour, this confusion and injustice, might be found, as suggested in various quarters, in the assimilation of the Parliamentary and Local Government register, by the extension of the Parliamentary franchise to all women now entitled to the Municipal, Local Government, or Parochial vote.¹ But this remedy, though it would no doubt to some extent simplify procedure, would be only a partial remedy, leaving untouched many of the causes of confusion and grievance. Moreover, so long as property, in whatever form, and not simple humanity, is the basis of electoral qualifications, so long will those qualifications represent and maintain a privileged injustice. It is humanity, with its claims and wants, its faculties and powers, that needs and demands full civic and representative rights. And humanity is not of one sex only, but includes the mothers as well as the fathers of the race. The only true and permanent remedy, whether applied at once or more gradually, lies in the sweeping away of all narrow or special qualifications, and in the establishment of adult suffrage, women on the same footing with men, for all voting purposes, any residential qualification (six months or even three months would then be sufficient) being simply for purposes of identification and convenience, and to prevent personation or plural voting. The franchise is the right of each, because it is necessary to the protection of each, and because the civic energy of each is essential to the true commonwealth.

Registration should be freed from the incubus of party political agents, and made fully a public duty and charge; so that it should become as easy for the ordinary man or woman to be registered and to vote as to address and post a letter. In the case of aliens, this nation ought to be, and probably will be, at least as wisely generous as it desired the people of the Transvaal Republic to be, as to conditions of naturalisation. If even to male criminals the Parliamentary franchise, or the power to acquire it, is restored with the completion of their punishment, there can be no excuse for the

¹ These number, according to the latest Parliamentary Return, that of 1897, in England and Wales 729,768; in Scotland, 132,067. There has been, as yet, no similar return for Ireland, nor of the married women voters in any part of the United Kingdom.

life-long exclusion of the women of the nation. Only by the crass selfishness of officialdom on both sides of the House of Commons, and by the almost utter lack of sympathetic imagination on the part of the majority of the male electorate, has this exclusion lasted so long. The grievance of women is that, in their case, freedom has not

“Broadened down
From precedent to precedent,”

but that their rights and liberties have in various directions been narrowed, by the *obiter dicta* of legal authorities, by express judicial decisions, and by statutory enactment. The few things that have been won for women have been won at the cost of painful and protracted struggle, and meanwhile other things have been lost—and women have to be perpetually on their watch against aggressive and sinister legislation. When the present writer began to work for women's suffrage, the number of male electors was not one million. Now it has risen to nearly seven millions, and with each extension of the purely male electorate the difficulty of securing attention to and remedy for the wrongs affecting women has *steadily increased*, till at last it appears hopeless to look for any further or other remedial measures till this one vantage-ground of equal citizenship has been secured.

A Parliament of men, responsible to male electors only, cannot and will not find either the time or the needful intelligence to deal with the needs and wants of women. It may contemptuously toss to them, from time to time, some trivial concession; but almost uniformly in these later years, if it has given a little with one hand it has taken more away with the other.

It is a commonplace of political science that the wider the basis of representation, the greater the danger and injustice to the unrepresented. Now, this danger is not the less, but very much the greater, when *sex* is made the line of demarcation, and the interests, convictions, and emotions of the mother-half of the race remain without effect on political or national action. The sex-worship and sex-glorification of the male-half of the race means the deification of mere and sheer brute force, unrelieved by any free play of the gentler human emotions. It is beyond question the fact that there is less feeling amongst the mass of our countrymen now than fifteen years ago, for any solid movement of social reform; and unless it can be made to serve some fleeting party advantage, neither of the official political parties will touch it. And the reason is plain. Enfranchised manhood has not lifted up with it unenfranchised womanhood, but has left womanhood to be politically trampled underfoot. But the tyrant is only the slave turned inside out, and the enslaver of women becomes himself enslaved, first to his own lower nature,

and then speedily to those who know how to play upon that nature. The only adequate remedy is to turn to the paths of justice, to enfranchise women equally with men, and to co-operate with them as *equals*, for all social and political issues. With this change of mental and moral attitude towards women will the higher human education of men begin, and lead them upwards and onwards to nobler and yet nobler perceptions and developments of social and international justice.

IGNOTA.

WEALTH:

ITS PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION

THE most popular idea of "Wealth" is that it consists of money. A man is said to be wealthy when he has a large sum of money, *e.g.*, one who has £10,000 would be considered wealthy by one who has only £100. Again, in the same way, one who has £100,000 would be considered wealthier than the one who has £10,000, and so on. But what is wealth? There are no doubt a great many people in this country who are rich, but few or none would be able to explain clearly what wealth is.

I will suppose a man has £10,000 in hard cash. If he were to lock this money up in his iron safe and take out £50 each month for his personal expense, the whole amount would vanish in about seventeen years, so that he would not have a penny left at the end of that time if he were not earning anything to partially replace the amount spent. Now when he is reduced to this state we should not call him wealthy any longer. Wealthy men as a rule have very little money in their possession. Instead of bags of gold they keep good balances at their bankers. But this does not show what wealth is. Moreover, bankers do not keep with them the money that they owe to their customers. They always make profit by lending out this money which they keep as deposit for their constituents to other people who need credit, and are willing to pay good interest, so that they take a portion of the interest, say two-thirds, for themselves, and pay the remaining third to their customers. But this again does not explain what wealth is, because it is difficult to say what a bank balance, which is shown by a few figures only in the bankers' books, consists of.

Different commodities have been used as money in different countries and states of society; skins and hides are known to have been used by the Spartans and Carthaginians as money, and Homer tells us that "the armour of Diomed cost only nine oxen; whilst that of Glacicus cost a hundred" (*Iliad*, lib. vi., line 235).

The money of the Chinese once consisted of small cubes of pressed tea.

Now the earliest forms of wealth were probably implements for hunting and fishing, and in cold countries clothing and huts. At

this stage people began to tend domestic animals, and gradually with the increase of population these herds grew in number." As numbers thickened, people took to agriculture, and land took the first place in the inventory of wealth. But it does not follow that one who owns a great deal of land is rich, for the savages of Australia who possessed enormous quantities of land before the English took it were nevertheless very poor. Again, people may live upon land full of what is called natural riches and yet may be very poor, for they cannot in the absence of suitable implements turn those natural riches into wealth. So neither land nor natural riches are by themselves wealth.

Nassau Senior, one of the best writers on Economic Science, defined wealth in the following words: "Under that term we comprehend all those things, and those things only, which are transferable, are limited in supply, and are directly or indirectly productive of pleasure, or preventive of pain," or in other words useful. It may be said that all wealth consists of things desirable, or those that either directly or indirectly satisfy our wants. It is anything which has an exchange value. This will be readily understood when we take into consideration certain things which, however useful, cannot as a matter of fact be called wealth. Thus, the air we breathe has no exchange value whatever, for nothing can be got in exchange for it; in the same way the light of the sun of which there is plenty has no exchange value. Things to be wealth must be transferable. There are many things which can be literally handed over; others, such as land and houses, which do not permit of being so transferred, can change owners by a written deed. But there are certain things, as the love of relations, the esteem of friends, and the happiness of a good conscience, which though coming under the category of desirable things cannot be transferred; hence they fall short of the elements of wealth. Again, wealth must be limited in supply. If there is enough of any particular substance we do not appreciate a fresh supply of it. Thus the air we breathe, which, although it helps to keep us alive cannot be called wealth as there is always a plentiful supply, and we do not give anything in exchange to get it.

I have mentioned above that the Carthaginians and Spartans used oxen as a medium of exchange, while the money of the Chinese consisted of small cubes of pressed tea. The reason why they are unsuited as a medium of exchange in civilised countries is palpable. Products must frequently be brought to market which are worth only part of an ox, and part of a skin; but as an ox could not be divided, and as a skin when cut into parts would in all probability lose a part of its value, they could not very well be exchanged for such money. It must, however, be observed that divisibility is not the only element necessary in a commodity used

as a medium of exchange. It should also stand the test of time, for what good would it serve to introduce some perishable and easily damaged commodity as money? It is further necessary that each piece of coin of a certain weight and fineness should always be equivalent to another piece of the same weight and fineness, otherwise it would fail to have uniformity of value. Another element of great importance with regard to the first function of money to act as a general standard of value, is stability of value. All substances known to us are subject to some variations in their value, so that it would be impossible that there should be any absolutely invariable standard of value. The utmost that can be aimed at is, that the value of the substances to be selected as money should be sufficiently invariable to permit of its being advantageously used as money; otherwise, if the value of the substances selected changed rapidly, it would cause great disturbance in the commercial world, and all business transactions would be nothing more than gambling speculations. It will be evident on consideration that the desire of uniting the different qualities of invariability of value, durability, facility of transportation, and perfect sameness, formed the irresistible reasons why all the civilised communities have employed gold and silver as money. There are no doubt some commodities which also possess the other characteristics which qualify a substance to fulfil the functions of money, but none so conveniently fitted as gold and silver in point of invariability of value. Therefore, it is not to be supposed that their employment in this function has been due to pure accident, or to the genius of a particular individual, or to any peculiar combination of circumstances, but it grew naturally out of the wants and necessities of society and the peculiar qualities which they possessed. Turgot has very rightly observed "that they became money not in consequence of any arbitrary agreement among men, or of the intervention of any law, but by the nature and force of things." It was not directly with the introduction of gold and silver that *coined money* became the medium of exchange. When first brought to market, gold and silver like any other metal were in ingots. Sheep, oxen, cloth, &c., were then exchanged for gold and silver in the same way as they were bartered for iron, tin, &c. The parties having agreed upon the quality and quantity of the metal to be given in exchange for goods, the latter was determined by weight. The trouble and inconvenience attending the weighing of the metal in every particular transaction began to be felt; but the greatest impediment to the use of metals in this rude state was the difficulty of determining the degree of purity of particular ingots with sufficient accuracy. This method of assaying is one of great nicety, and notwithstanding the great improvements in science and art it is still no easy matter to ascertain with accuracy the quality

of a piece of metal. It is most probable that in early times when gold and silver began to be used as money, the only way by which their quality was roughly determined was by their weight and colour. But it can hardly be expected that this loose and unsatisfactory method led to any accurate results. To obviate this the ancients were not long in finding out some means by which the fineness of the metal used as medium of exchange could be at once made known without going through the elaborate process of weighing it each time that any business was transacted. This led to the introduction of *coined money* by which each piece was marked with a public stamp, which at once declared the weight and fineness of the coin. There can be no doubt that this invention was of the greatest practical utility, and has contributed in a great measure to the development of commerce and the progress of civilisation. Torrens (*On the Production of Wealth*) says:

"Without some article of known exchangeable value such as coin, readily received as an equivalent for other things, the interchange of commodities must have been very limited, and consequently the division of labour very imperfectly established. Now money obviates these evils, and by a two-fold operation augments production. In the first place, it saves all that time and labour which, while the intercourse between man and man is carried on by barter, must frequently intervene before a person can be supplied with the quantity of the commodity which he wants. In the second place, and in consequence of its saving the time and labour which must otherwise be spent in effecting exchanges, it multiplies the transactions of mercantile industry, and thus allows the divisions of employment to be more thoroughly established. By the first operation it disengages a very considerable portion of labour from an unproductive occupation, and enables it to receive a more useful direction. By the second operation it increases in a very high degree the productive powers of the labour already usefully employed. It assists every man in availing himself of the skill and dexterity which he may acquire in any particular calling, and promotes cultivation in a manner suitable to the climate and soil of different districts and of different countries. And by both these operations coined money increases to an extent not easy to be calculated the wealth of civilised communities."

A few moments' reflection will at once convince us that the origin of every article of commerce, whatever it may be, can be directly or indirectly traced to *land*. The importance of land as an agent of production is so great that at one time the French economists thought it to be the only source of wealth. The mineral wealth of the world is no doubt very great, but what good would that be to *society* unless the mines could be worked and the produce brought to the surface, which will necessarily involve labour and capital? It is impossible to manufacture any goods unless we have matter to work upon. Everything that we use and touch and eat contains matter or substance, so that there must be a beginning with the right sort of materials. Now it will be quite plain why land, labour and capital, which are commonly called the three requisites of produc

tion, play such an important part in the wealth of the whole world. Capital can hardly be said to be one of the primary requisites of production; it is perhaps the secondary requisite, for capital is the result of the work of man aided by nature. It may be defined as that part of wealth which is saved in order to assist future production. A savage, for instance, while living on the wild fruits and roots of the forest may collect some and sell them in the market without the aid of any previously acquired wealth. Some parts of the earth's surface turn out to be more productive and eminently better suited to particular kind of crops than others. There are many circumstances which increase the productive powers of the land. Chemistry has taught us the most approved methods of manuring the soil whose productive capacity is different in different parts of the country, according as the land is supplied with abundant sunlight and moisture. Again, the soil must have certain mechanical and chemical qualities. It will be found on investigation that plant life in the soil is an important factor which makes it fertile. The following lines from Professor Marshall's *Principles of Economics* will show how much mechanical and chemical conditions influence the fertility of land:

"The soil must be so far yielding that the fine roots of plants can push their way freely in it; and yet it must be firm enough to give them a good hold. It must not err, as some sandy soils do, by affording water too free a passage; for then it will often be dry, and the plant food will be washed away almost as soon as it is formed in the soil or put into it. The action of fresh air and water, and of frosts, are nature's tillage of the soil; and even unaided they will in time make almost any part of the earth's surface fairly fertile if the soil that they form can rest where it is, and is not torn away downhill by rain and torrents as soon as it is formed. But man gives great aid in this mechanical preparation of the soil. The chief purpose of his tillage is to help nature to enable the soil to hold plant-roots gently but firmly, and to enable the air and water to move about freely in it. Chemically, the soil must have the inorganic elements that the plant wants in a form palatable to it. The greater part of the bulk of the plant is made up of so-called organic compounds—i.e., compounds of carbon, chiefly with oxygen, hydrogen, and nitrogen; and of these it obtains by far the greater part from air and water. Only a small fraction of its dry bulk consists of mineral matter that it cannot get except from the soil. And as most soils have given them by nature at least some small quantities of all the mineral substances that are necessary for plant life, they can support some sort of vegetation without human aid."

With all these means the fertility of the soil can be fairly brought under man's control, and any land can be made to grow large crops provided the inherent qualities which the land derives from nature, and the artificial properties which it owes to human agency, are properly utilised.

It has been mentioned before that "labour"—the muscular and mental force of man—is a main element in almost all kinds of production. But what is "labour"? The farmer ploughs his field,

the philosopher sits at his table to write a book on the doctrine of ethical justice. Both are said to labour; but the result of their labour is very different. One works with his body, the other with his brain—yet still there is something common in both, *i.e.*, each labours to produce something. Professor Jevons has defined labour as “any exertion of mind and body undergone partly or wholly with a view to some good other than the pleasure derived directly from the work.” Though “labour” is one of the primary requisites in the production of wealth, still it will be seen that there are certain kinds of labour which, though very useful, do not assist the production of wealth. Such kind of labour which does not help either directly or indirectly to increase the material wealth of the community may be called “*unproductive*,” while that which “produces utilities fixed and embodied in material objects” is called “*productive*.” Although theoretically this distinction exists, it is very difficult to say whether the labour of a particular class of labourer will prove productive or unproductive. Sometimes it happens that the labour of productive labourers turns out to be most unproductive, as for instance in the case of the “labour which produced the numerous unfinished canals, which were abandoned about the time when it became apparent that railroads would supersede water-carriage.” On the other hand, it has happened that the labour of many scientific chemists has been accidentally rewarded with success in discovering the chemical properties of substances which have facilitated many industrial processes. It will thus be seen that all the distinctions in which the word “productive” is used are very thin and hardly worth while to dwell upon. All labour is counted as unproductive which ends in immediate enjoyment without increasing the accumulated stock of permanent means of enjoyment.

Nothing could be plainer and more self-evident than the fact that one must work to produce wealth. The primary object of labour must be to get as much wealth as we can with a reasonable amount of labour. In order that this may be practicable we must labour under the most favourable conditions of *time* and *place*, and in such a *manner* that no part of labour is wasted. In order that the world may grow rich, each country ought to produce things which it can most easily do, and get other commodities in exchange from foreign countries where the cost of production is the least. In the south of England vines can be made to grow in the open air, but they grow better on the sunny hills of France and Italy, and consequently the wines which can be made there with the same amount of labour are infinitely better in quality and more plentiful in supply. In England the soil is good and the climate moist, which both eminently fit the land for the growth of grass; so the best thing English farmers can do is to direct their attention to raise cattle and produce plenty of cheese, cream and other preparations from milk. It is thus

evident that every part of the world is capable of producing certain commodities more easily than other countries, and if governments would direct their attention to increasing the material prosperity of nations they would withdraw the shameful restrictions (such as duties) imposed on foreign goods and allow trade to be as free as possible.

India, with a population of 280,000,000 of people and an area which is many hundred times larger than Great Britain and Ireland, is nevertheless very poor--(average income in Great Britain and Ireland per head is £37, average income in India per head is Rs. 10). And why is this? Sir William Wedderburn says, "India possesses the conditions of almost boundless agricultural wealth. In her vast domain she has climate suited to every known product; she has a fertile soil and an unfailing sun, with abundant labour," which is extremely cheap. Notwithstanding the great educational developments of the century, and the encouragement which the country has received from the government in support of the numerous schools and colleges, India still continues to be a purely agricultural country, where nearly 83 per cent. of her population are agricultural. The nature of the soil is not the same in all parts of the country; some lands are low, others high, some waste and sterile, others arable and fertile. Now to improve the soil, to know what particular tract of land is adapted to the healthy growth of a particular crop, "selecting such a rotation that each will leave the land in such a state and at such a time of year, that it can be worked up easily and without loss of time into a suitable seed bed for the coming crop," our peasantry are guided more by a sort of instinct than the rudimentary principles of agricultural science. Certain crops absorb an exceptionally large amount of certain minerals, and these may happen not to come back in manure to the particular land from which they are taken; and of course any such special deficiency cannot be made good by farmyard manure without giving the soil more than it wants of some other things. Lime for example runs short, and potash is often in great demand in sandy soils, particularly when root crops are grown on them. Thus the fertility of the soil can be permanently altered by the process of drainage, or by mixing with it other soil that will supplement its deficiencies.

In order that labour may be employed to the best advantage it is necessary that *the labourer should be guided by a scientific knowledge of things with which he is dealing*; or, in other words, he should be acquainted with the causes of things, *i.e.*, what things must be put together in order that certain other things could be produced. Now the Indian husbandmen are sadly deficient in this. They are ignorant of agricultural science even of an elementary character, which is so essential in securing the best available outturn of crops, and thus reduce the chance of failure of crop to a minimum.

When a number of workmen are seen engaged in a large factory,

we generally find that each man takes one part of the work, and leaves other parts to his assistants and sub-assistants. This will be clear if we take an example from a very trilling manufacture, viz., the trade of the pin-maker. One would scarcely think that such an insignificant looking thing as a pin passes through *eighteen* distinct operations before it takes that form. One man draws the wire, another straightens it, a third cuts it, a fourth points it, a fifth files one end of it to receive the head; then the head has to be made, which passes through two or three distinct operations before it is complete; and last but not least is the art of putting them into the paper, which is quite a trade by itself. Thus a small manufactory with only about a dozen hands could turn out among them about twelve pounds of pins in a day. Now if they had all worked separately and independently, without any previous experience in the art of pin-making, they could not make even twenty pins a day. This will show what an important part the division of labour plays in different trades and employments, and how much it occasions a proportionable increase of the productive powers of labour. The various advantages obtained by the division of labour were enumerated by Adam Smith as follows:—1. The dexterity of the workmen is increased. 2. Time is saved by the workmen not passing from one employment to another. 3. Suitable machinery is more likely to be invented if the minds of the workmen are concentrated on a special process. With regard to the first advantage, there can be no doubt that workmen gain experience by being employed in one particular work, and by continued practice in handling the same tools and machinery they acquire great individual proficiency. Adam Smith pointed out that a lad who had devoted nearly all his life to making nails would make them twice as quickly as an experienced blacksmith who only did the work occasionally. “Any one who has to perform exactly the same set of operations day after day on things of exactly the same shape, gradually learns to move his fingers exactly as they are wanted, by almost automatic action and with greater rapidity than would be possible if every movement had to wait for a deliberate instruction of the will.” Again, in the wood and the metal industries, if a man has to perform exactly the same operations over and over again on the same piece of material, he gets into the habit of holding it exactly in the way in which it is wanted, and of arranging the tools and other things which he has to handle in such positions that he is able to bring them to work on one another with the least possible loss of time and of force in the movements of his own body. Accustomed to find them always in the same positions, and to take them in the same order, his hands work in harmony with one another almost automatically: and with increased practice his expenditure of nervous force diminishes even more rapidly than his expenditure of muscular force.

Although there are many advantages to be obtained from the division of labour, it is not without its evils. In the first place it tends to limit a man's power considerably, and not infrequently the intelligence and artistic perception of the workman remain quite undeveloped throughout his whole life when he has to do the same kind of work every day. A man becomes, as it has been said, worth only the tenth part of a pin, *i.e.*, there are men who can only make the head of a pin and nothing more.

Another disadvantage of the division of labour is that it makes trade very complicated, and when deranged, the results are ruinous to some people. This will be clear when we take, for instance, the case of a person who learns to supply a particular kind of goods. When they are in demand no doubt his business flourishes, but if change of fashion or any other cause tends to a falling off in the demand for such article, the man is left to starve until he can learn some other trade to compete with those who have long practised it. This necessarily involves a great reduction in his income, for however intelligent a man may be he cannot in the beginning successfully compete with another in a trade in which that other has been brought up from a very early age..

Now we come to the third requisite in the production of wealth which, as has been mentioned before, is called "capital." I will endeavour to explain what is meant by capital. Of course the most popular interpretation of the word is that it is identical with money. If this were so, we would have had "money" instead of "capital" as one of the three requisites in the production of wealth. Money is only a medium of exchange and a measure of value. We have seen that the money of the Chinese once consisted of cubes of pressed tea, which in the present state of society would not be considered as medium of exchange, but if one had a ton of these cubes of pressed tea, that would undoubtedly be capital, for it will assist him in producing wealth. Adam Smith defines capital in the following words:

"Capital is that part of a man's stock from which he expects to derive an income. It is the result of saving, but it does not follow that hoarded wealth increases the capital of the country. The most prominent question which naturally suggests itself is, how do we get capital? Economists have come to the conclusion that capital is the result of saving. . . . The spendthrift who always wastes his substance in riotous living decreases the wealth of the country";

and the idea that reckless extravagance is good for trade is a logical fallacy. The causes which control the accumulation of wealth differ widely in different countries and different ages. There are generally two motives which produce a desire to save: first, a prudent foresight for the future; secondly, the desire to acquire more wealth by judicious investments. But the chief motive of saving is perhaps

family affection. Were it not for this many who now work and save carefully would not exert themselves more than securing for themselves a comfortable income after they had retired from their work. That men labour and save chiefly to provide for their family and children is shown by the fact that after they retire they live chiefly on the interest of their investment, leaving their stored-up wealth for their families.

"In India and to a less extent in Ireland we find people who do indeed abstain from immediate enjoyment and save up considerable sums with great self-sacrifice, but spend all their savings in lavish festivities at funerals and marriages. They make intermittent provision for the near future, but scarcely any permanent provision for the distant future." In uncivilised countries we notice that a desire to save is scarcely ever prevalent. This is in a great measure due to the inability of the people to look forward to the future, and also to the insecurity of property among uncivilised communities where any settled form of government is unknown.

It has been noticed before that capital is to be distinguished from money with which it is in ordinary nomenclature almost identical. But what is capital? The task of defining capital is not so easy as to include the two main attributes of productiveness and prospectiveness in all its various uses, which belong in some degree to every form of individual wealth. In ordinary life capital is generally regarded from the point of view of the individual. Adam Smith has said that a person's capital is that part of his stock from which he expects to derive an income. We may follow Mill in distinguishing *circulating capital*, "which fulfils the whole of its office in the production in which it is engaged, by a single use," from *fixed capital*, which exists "in a durable shape, and the return to which is spread over a period of corresponding duration." Thus factories, machines, tools, docks, and other things which last a long time and assist work would be called fixed; whereas churches, monuments, books, &c., are circulating capital, because they do not help in producing new wealth. But the principal phenomena of capital are found to be the same whether the form of investment is more or less permanent. The machinery which is of the nature of fixed capital, and yields a profit without apparently changing hands, is in reality passing away day by day, until it is worn out and has to be replaced. Thus capital is altogether a question of time, and is more fixed as it endures or continues useful for a longer period; it is more circulating in proportion as it is sooner worn out, and thus requires to be more frequently replaced.

It has been mentioned in the preceding pages what wealth is, how it is to be used, and how it may be produced in the greatest quantities. It now remains to be considered how wealth is distributed.

It has been stated that land, labour, and capital are the three agents which produce wealth. It is therefore evident that wealth must be distributed between those who are the owners of these agents of production, *i.e.*, between the landlord, the labourer, and the capitalist. If, however, the three agents were supplied by one man, no doubt the produce ought all to belong to him with the exception of what is taken by the Government as taxes. But in a civilised society it is not possible that the same person should own all the land, employ his capital and also labour to produce wealth. The production of wealth, therefore, does not depend upon the exertion of one particular individual, but it is the result of the proper bringing together of land, labour, and capital by different classes of persons. Hence it is quite natural to suppose that these persons should have their several shares in the wealth produced, and may even ask for more than their proper share.

Sometimes the same person owns the capital and the land, but not the labour. The landlord, in his engagement directly with the labourer, supplies the whole part of the stock necessary for cultivation. This system is prevalent in Continental Europe, where the holders are neither serfs nor proprietors. In other cases the labourer does not own the land, but owns the little stock employed on it—the landlord not being in the habit of supplying any. This system is nearly universal in India and all countries in the east, and also in Ireland. The state of things is, however, better in India than in Ireland. Here the owner of land is in the habit of making advances to the cultivators, for which he charges high rate of interest; but the principal landowner, the Government, makes advances without interest, recovering the amount after the harvest when the rent becomes payable. These are the principal classifications in the distribution of agricultural labour. In the case of manufacturing industry, however, there are generally two classes—the capitalists and the labourers. This shows that it is not mere chance or caprice which governs the sharing of wealth, but that there are natural and customary laws which regulate this distribution: we may, as a general rule, divide the produce of work into four shares, *viz.*, wages, rent, interest, and taxes. It would not be possible to discuss fully the respective functions of these, so I shall only point out the relation which these four parts bear to each other.

Broadly speaking, wages are a compensation made to the labourer for the exertion of his physical powers, or his skill or ingenuity. Naturally this must vary according as we require greater skill with reference to a particular work. To take an ordinary example, the wages of a watch-maker would be greater than that of a carpenter who makes chairs. This at once shows why the price of commodities varies according to the cost of their production, that is, by the

quantities of labour spent in producing them and in bringing them to market. Again, wages vary in proportion to the ease and hardship, the constancy and inconstancy of employment, the agreeableness or disagreeableness of the employments themselves, the easiness or cheapness, or the difficulty and expense of learning the occupation, and lastly, the probability or improbability of success. I will mention here very shortly how there often arise great differences in the rates of wages in different occupations. It no doubt seems very unfair that some labourers should be paid a hundred or even a thousand times as much per day than others for their work. This is due partly to the intellectual attainments and natural endowments which these people have happened to enjoy.

Now "rent" is properly "that portion of the produce of the earth which is paid by the occupier to the landlord for the use of the natural and inherent powers of the soil." The rent of a house or factory would not be all rent in the true sense of the term, for capital must have been spent in erecting the building or factory, and interest must have been paid on the capital, so that we must deduct this interest from what is commonly known as rent before we come at the true rent. The rent of agricultural land is governed by two circumstances: the fertility of the soil and the convenience of situation. When either of these conditions is altogether absent, land can command no rent. Thus, no one will pay rent for land the produce of which will not compensate the capital and labour spent in cultivating it. Lands situate in the immediate vicinity of a large town generally fetch higher rent than those that are situated some twenty or thirty miles off, provided the latter has no other market. The town affords a ready outlet for a great variety of articles for which there is little or no demand in the country. Inasmuch as the cost of conveying articles varies with the distance and difficulty of the roads along which they have to be carried, the less charge on those raised in the vicinity of markets enables their growers to pay a proportionally greater amount of rent.

Now we will see what interest is. Every one knows that money is lent to other people for a certain period, during which he pays to the lender a certain sum as consideration for the loan. This is what is popularly known as interest. This interest will of course be greater or less according as the amount of capital is greater or less; it will also be greater or less according as the capital is employed for a longer or shorter time, so the rate of interest is proportionate to the capital sum and the time during which that is employed. The profits of capital are greatest in those pursuits in which the greatest risk is incurred and where the labour of superintendence is most costly. In uncivilised countries the insecurity of property causes compensation for risk to form a very large proportion of the profits of capital. Mill says: "Those who lend under these wretched governments do so

at the utmost peril of never being paid." So when capital is lent at a very high rate of interest, say 20 or 30 per cent., it will not be true interest, but compensation for the risk of losing the capital altogether. There is an important fact about interest, that it is the same in one business as in another. The rates of profit differ very much, it is true, but this is because the labour of superintendence is different and because there is greater risk in one trade than in another. But the true interest is the same, because capital being lent in the form of money can be lent to one trade just as easily as to another. Thus there is a constant tendency to the equality of interest in all branches of industry.

It is admitted that the legitimate functions of good government are the protection of life and property of its subjects and the maintenance of equal freedom of all. These necessarily entail serious expenditure, and it is only just and proper that the nation for whose benefit the institutions are made should contribute to defray the expense incurred for their maintenance, in proportion to their respective abilities, *i.e.*, in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy under the protection of the State. This money must necessarily be raised by taxation. There are certain rules the due observance of which secures the minimum hardship on the tax-payer and maximum revenue to the government. It would not be possible in this short space to narrate them fully, but the existence of such rules is undoubtedly of great advantage to the community. Duty on manufactured articles is a form of tax which evidently is imposed to encourage local industries. If purchasers are prevented on account of heavy duty from purchasing foreign articles, they will have to buy goods made in the country, and thus keep the men in the trade busy. This theory appeals more to the people in general, to those who take only a superficial view of things, for it is an undeniable fact that the purchase of foreign articles encourages home manufactures in the best possible way, as foreigners would not send us goods if we did not pay for them either in money or by sending other goods in exchange. Now, if goods are sent in exchange, workmen will be needed to replace them, and the more we buy goods of foreign manufacture the greater necessity will there be to produce articles at home to be sent in exchange.

I have succinctly referred to the respective functions which wages, rent, interest and taxes play in the distribution of wealth, and I hope I have been able to give the reader some idea how the wealth of the whole world is regulated by fixed and customary laws, and not by mere caprice.

G. D. SEAL.

THE SELJUKS BEFORE THE CRUSADES.

WESTERN EUROPE has been familiar with the name of the Turks since the invasion of the Huns, for it is indisputable that they were of the Turkish stock.¹

They, however, came in contact with the Moslem world at the time of Motassim, the third son of Khalif Haroon-ar-Rashid. It was Motassim who first enlisted them in his soldiery, but they who entered as slaves were fated ere long to preside over the destiny of the Khalifate of Bagdad.

It was, indeed, with the help of these Turkish archers that the general of Motassim defeated the Byzantine army, commanded by Theophilus and Manuel, at Dasymon.²

The introduction of this Turkish mercenary force was, indeed, one of the many causes which brought about the fall of the Abbasides. It began to play the same part which was played in Italy by Recimer, Gundobad, and Orestes. It made and unmade four Khalifs successively.³

So extensive, indeed, had become its authority that in 879 Ahmed, the son of Tholon, rendered himself independent in Egypt, and founded a dynasty (879-968) which was at last conquered by the Fatemites. The state of Bagdad was distressing; after a beautiful dawn a sultry noon had set in. During the time of decay and dissolution there were Khalifs incapable of meeting the difficulties of sovereignty and unworthy of wielding its authority. There was no Leo, or Zeno, or Anastasius to breathe fresh vigour into the decayed constitution and thereby prolong its life.

Bagdad was sinking day by day into political insignificance. In the tenth century Khalif Radhi placed in the hands of his minister the administration of finance, the power of waging war and of making peace—in fine, metamorphosed him into the veritable Khalif,⁴ and contented himself with the vain and empty title. This newly-created minister used and abused his power till the long pent-up resentment of the people of Bagdad found vent in a

¹ Gibbon, ed. Milman, vol. v. p. 172, note (a).

² Finlay, vol. ii. p. 157.

³ Jonquière, *L'Emp. Ottoman*, p. 104.

⁴ Guyard, *Le Civilisation Musulmane*, pp. 25, 26.

vigorous protest. The help of the Bouides of Persia was sought and obtained, and the Turks, who had become so influential in Bagdad, were driven out; but the title of Emirul-Amra was coveted by the new conqueror. For a century the fate of Bagdad remained in the hands of the *Bouides*, who in the end yielded to a higher power, though not without a struggle.

The new actors in the world's drama were the Seljuks. In the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries a great portion of Asia was ruled by Turkish dynasties.¹ The first heroes of the Seljukian Turks were *Togrul Beg*, *Chakir Beg*, and *Ibrahim Niyal*, the sons of Mikail, the son of Seljuk. They were members of the Turkish tribe of *Ghuzz*, and traced their descent from *Oghuz*, the eponymous hero of all Turkish tribes. This band of Turks came into the fold of Islam in the fourth century after the Flight. They dwelt beyond the Oxus,² and were viewed not without serious apprehension by the neighbouring Mahomedan State. The policy of *Mahmud*, the Ghaznvide, was distinctly hostile towards them. This course of action was extremely politic, as events in the sequel will show. He drove the Seljuks to *Aderbijan*; but his son and successor, Masud, deviated from the wise and cautious policy of his father, and enlarged his army by 1000 Turkish horsemen, taken from these fugitives of *Aderbijan*. The policy of *Mahmud* to keep these Seljukian marauders aloof from his dominions was completely reversed, and the unwise Masud paid only the penalty of his indiscretion in the battle of Merv. In this battle, which was fought in the year 1040, the Ghaznvides were completely defeated.

But before this successful attempt of the Seljukians, the Turkish tribes had made many abortive efforts to extend their dominion. Under the leadership of *Israil* or *Pigu Arslan*, a portion of the Seljuks crossed the *Oxus* and spread over the Eastern provinces of Persia. This adventurer was captured and imprisoned by Masud, but his punishment, instead of staying off the impending fall of the Ghaznvides, only precipitated it. His nephews, either exasperated at the imprisonment of their uncle or swayed by motives of plunder, crossed the Oxus and swooped down like a whirlwind on the plains of Persia. After a desperate battle, Persia, once the kingdom of the *Sassanides*, received as lords the Scythian hordes. This was the famous battle of Merv. Shortly after this Merv was raised to the dignity of a capital, and Togrul saluted as the chief of the Seljuks.³

The victory of Merv inspired confidence in the princes. Togrul Beg, Chakir Beg, and Ibrahim Niyal began their career of conquest; but their success was not without occasional failures. Ibrahim was

¹ There is an excellent article on the Seljuks in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*.

² Ibn Khallikan, art. on Togrul and Alp Arslan, vol. iii. pp. 224-34.

³ See the curious way in which the Turks used to elect their king.—Migne, *Dict. des Croisades*, p. 996.

the most successful in his military exploits; he bore his victorious banner in the year 1048 as far as Melzikerd, Erzeroum, and Trebizond. The jealous Togrul watched the career of Ibrahim with impatience and animosity, and, in an angry passion, called upon him to surrender to him his claim over *Hamulan* and *Jebel*—his recent conquests. This unpalatable request met with a peremptory refusal. A civil war, which for a moment checked the advancing career of the Seljuks, was the result of this fraternal friction. Ultimately Ibrahim was compelled to submit.

At this juncture, when the progress of the upstart race was in full tide, Bagdad was at its last gasp. The khalifs of Bagdad, we have already noticed, were incompetent and *fainçants*; ruled by the Bouides or some other Turkish potentate. At the time of *Al Kaim B'Amrillah*, Bassari, the General of the Turkish troop of mercenaries at Bagdad, who had the chief authority there, revolted against *Al Kaim*, and even succeeded in expelling him from Bagdad. The injured *khalif* enjoyed liberal hospitality at the hands of *Al Okaili*,¹ Lord of *Al Haditha* and *Ana*; and after experiencing the humble fortune of an exile for an entire year, obtained the aid of Togrul. The Seljukian chief entered Bagdad and seized the person of *Malik-ar-Rahm*, the last prince of the Bouides.

Bassasiri, however, just managed to escape. He sought help among the *Fatémites*, acknowledged the Khalif as the true successor of Mahomet, and successfully fanned the smouldering passions of Ibrahim Niyal into a blaze.

Bassasiri, with the help of these two potentates, attained a partial success and reinstated himself in Bagdad at the close of the year 1058. The vigilant Togrul was ready at hand to mar his success. In the next year, Bassasiri, after attaining this "bad eminence," fell a victim to treachery, and was slain in battle; while the turbulent brother of Togrul was strangled.

No sooner had Togrul planted his foot in *Irak* and *Aderbijan* than he directed his attention to the 600 miles of frontier which extend from *Taurus* to *Erzeroum*. In 1060 he laid siege to Edessa, but his effort was foiled by Vest, the Commander of Antioch, that venerable city where the followers of Christ were first called Christians. It was this city, indeed, which for a time rendered the power of the Turks insecure in *Asia Minor*; and we might fix upon the year 1068, when Antioch was betrayed by Philaretus, as the real date of the foundation of *Sultanat of Roum*.

To celebrate these brilliant victories, Togrul re-entered Bagdad, and was betrothed to the sister of the Khalif, but died in September 1063, before the marriage² could take place. While the waves of Turkish

¹ Ibn Khall. vol. i. p. 173.

² Deguignes, *Histoire des Huns*, tom. ii. part ii. pp. 189, 196-98. See Ibn Khallikan, concerning the marriage of Togrul.

invasion were sweeping over Syria and Asia Minor, the Byzantine Empire showed no sign of arresting its progress. Fiscal oppression and social disaffection had been for some time the evils of the Second Rome. Ever since Justinian, who prodigally lavished the accumulated wealth of Anastasius in the long conflict with Persians, Vandals and Goths, the pinchbeck Augustus drained the wealth of the nation and filled the imperial treasury. The avarice and the sloth of Constantine not only encouraged the onsets of the Turks from without, but also encouraged the aspirations of the Norman mercenaries within its bounds. It was in his reign that Robert Guiscard took Bari, the last stronghold of the Byzantine Empire in Italy. Every kind of abuse was current in the Empire, rebellion and insurrections had become commonplace.

The short reign of Nicephorus III. was disfigured by five rebellions, of which four proved abortive. The fifth, however, was successful, and put the crafty Alexius at the head of the Byzantine Empire. The founder of the house of *Comnenes* impersonated in himself the vices of his age. Capable of simulation and dissimulation, he played throughout a treacherous part in the crusades, though, perhaps, his faults were magnified by the hatred of the Latin historians.

Indeed, an impartial historian will not accuse Alexius of the manifold misfortunes suffered by the crusaders in their march.¹ But to discuss this matter would take me beyond the limits of my subject.

Before the much-censured Alexius had ascended the throne Togrul had died, and the chieftainship of the Turks had devolved on the famous *Alp Arslan*, who might well be chosen as the hero of an epic.

The virtues of his uncle were reflected in his character, and in his short but brilliant career he strove to surpass him both in conquest and magnanimity. The first act of this new chief was to lead his army into Iberia and the Northern parts of Armenia. He next attacked the capital of Armenia, *Ani*, which is situated on a rocky peninsula overhanging the rapid stream of *Rha*, the ancient Harpasus.² After a gallant resistance the capital of Armenia was taken on July 6, 1064. By this Conquest Alp Arslan reduced Armenia and Georgia to complete subjection. The Turks now ravaged Melitene, Syria, Cilicia, and Cappadocia at their will; Provinces which in the past had endured with patience the widely desolating ravages of the Sassindes, the Omyyads, and the Abbaside Khalifs. The Greeks, who at first bore these Turkish ravages with cynical indifference, were roused to resistance when they saw the inhabitants of Cæsarea massacred and the Church of Basil plundered.

¹ See the eloquent defence of the learned Anna, pp. 488, 491; Finlay, vol. iii. pp. 1-52.

² Finlay, vol. iii. p. 18.

This was in the days of the rash and impetuous Diogenes, who had become Emperor by virtue of his marriage with Endocia.

For two years *Alp Arslan's* lieutenants continued to ravage Asia Minor. In four successive campaigns Diogenes undertook the expulsion of the Turks; but what might have been discernible to the unsealed eye of a prophet was concealed from the ordinary man. The result of all these campaigns was remarkable. At first Diogenes strove to save Antioch from the Saracens of Aleppo; but, before anything had been done in that quarter it was noised abroad that the Turks were once more plundering Asia Minor. The news at once called Diogenes to the North, but such was the rapidity of the Turkish retreat that before his arrival they had gone back into their own territories. The expedition proving useless, Diogenes returned to Constantinople in the year 1069.

In the following year Manuel, the brother of the future Emperor Alexius, made Sebaste his head-quarters, with a view to establishing an effectual bulwark against the Turks. This Manuel, however, in an unfortunate conflict with a Turkish leader, was made prisoner, and his captor, Chrysokraul, began to nourish seditious plans against Alp Arslan. The fiery Alp Arslan, indignant at such schemes, and exasperated by the moral support lent by Manuel to the rebellious vassal, once more took the offensive and besieged Menzikert, which lies between Erzeroum and Lake Wan. Diogenes marched to its relief and retook it with the greatest ease. The Turks proposed a treaty, but their overtures were spurned, and Diogenes hazarded a battle.¹ Many causes contributed to the defeat of the Byzantine Emperor. He was betrayed by his own generals; and on August 26, 1071, Alp Arslan won a decisive victory. The vigorous pages of Gibbon have described with dramatic effect the treatment of Romanus Diogenes by Alp Arslan. An honourable treaty was concluded, and Diogenes willingly agreed to pay an annual tribute of three thousand and sixty pieces of gold, and to liberate his Moslem captives.

On his defeat, the tide of popular favour turned against the unfortunate Romanus. It was some ten years after this crisis that Alexius was hailed Emperor with general acclamation² by the Byzantine people. The career of Alp Arslan, however, was shortened by the dagger of an assassin shortly after his great victory at Menzikert, but even that great conqueror's death could not prevent Asia Minor from being the prey of Turkish bandits.

Alp Arslan's successor was the famous Malik Shah, whose name owes an additional glory to the noble qualities and administrative vigour of his chief minister, *Nizamul-Mulk*. In the year 1072, he succeeded Alp Arslan, after encountering an opposition from his uncle *Kawurd*. He accomplished the conquest of Turkistan—the

¹ Migne, *Diet. des Croisades*, p. 998; Gibbon, vol. vii. p. 60.

² Defeat of Romanus, 1071; Alexius Emperor, 1081.

idea which long floated in the mind of Alp Arslan. Syria and Palestine bowed before his victorious arm; and Bochara, Samarkand, and Khorassan submitted without a blow. Under Malik Shah, the Seljukian Empire reached the meridian of its glory. He conceded Syria to his brother *Tutush*, who established himself at Damascus, and killed *Atsitz*.¹ Also Malik Shah entrusted *Suleiman* with a subordinate sovereignty in Asia Minor. It was this Suleiman who became the founder of the *Sultanat of Roum*. The events were indeed favourable to the Turks. Persecution and fiscal oppression, which had been the peculiar features of the Byzantine Empire, rendered the Christian population extremely hostile to the Greeks.²

In addition to the hatred felt by many of its subjects for the Byzantine Empire, other circumstances tended to strengthen the Seljukean power in Asia Minor. In the year 1074, Michael VII., to obtain the aid of the Turkish mercenary force in quelling the rebellion of John Dukas, recognised the dominion of Suleiman.

Nicephorus III. gave additional weight to the treaty concluded with Michael by confirming it. This policy was adopted by Nicephorus so as to get the help of the Turks in dethroning Michael VII. A similar process was repeated when Nicephorus Milissenos rebelled against Nicephorus III. This rebel went even further and yielded up the possession of Nicea to *Suleiman*, who made it his capital. Even Alexius, to avoid hostile contact with *Suleiman*, who held under him the greater part of Asia Minor, wisely marked the Drako as the boundary between their kingdoms. It was to this ambitious chief that Antioch was betrayed by Philaretus in 1084, when the Sultanat of Roum was fixed on a permanent basis. By taking Antioch, Suleiman was involved in a war with Tutush, and died in the battle against him near *Shaizar* in 1086.

These discords solicited the attention of Malik Shah, who kept the sons of Suleiman in captivity, and entrusted the affairs of Asia Minor to his generals, *Bursuk* and *Buzan*.

Then, after a long and prosperous reign of twenty years, vanished from the scene Malik Shah, leaving the throne and the sceptre to *Barkiyarok*. This monarch, on his accession in 1092, allowed *Kilig Arslan*, the son of Suleiman, to return to the dominion of his father.

It was this Kilig Arslan who in 1096 defeated and killed the reckless band of Crusaders under Walter the Pennyless.³

After the death of Malik Shah, the kingdom of the Seljuk was dismembered, suffering the same fate as that of Charles the Great, after the death of that great emperor. One of the reasons which Guizot assigns for the decline of the Empire of Charlemagne applies with equal truth to the Empire of Malik Shah. He thinks that in an age when mankind is still in its infancy it is impossible to wield

¹ Ibn Khall. art. on Tutush, vol. i. p. 273.

² Finlay, vol. iii. p. 88.

³ On this point the recital of *Albert* is ample and amusing.—*Coll. des Mémoires*, par Guizot, tom. xx. pp. 22-92.

the machinery of government with any efficiency over large and extensive kingdoms, such as those of Charles the Great or Malik Shah, the Seljuk.

Not only is there a want of sufficient intelligence among the people, but there are also natural barriers which render communication between one State and another rare and difficult. Immediately after the death of Malik Shah, the symptoms of weakness manifested themselves—symptoms against which no political wisdom could contend with effect. Distinct and independent principalities were formed; and the division of a vast kingdom into units tended to weaken the power of the Moslem State as a whole. We are not concerned here with the history of the reigns of the sons of Malik Shah.

Tutush, who had been entrusted with the command of Syria by Malik Shah, died fighting, near *Rai* in 1095, against *Barykarok*.

Just before the arrival of the Crusades the spirit of faction and a defiant independence had become general among the Moslems, and it was a wise and shrewd remark of *Ibn-al-Atir*, that it was this spirit of disunion amongst the Moslem chiefs that favoured the arms of the Christians.¹ If the Moslems had had a ruler like Alp Arslan or Malik Shah when the Crusaders burst upon Syria, the latter would never have attained the success which they actually did in the first Crusade. The ill-organised army, the unwieldy councils of war, the recurrent conflicts between the chiefs, the long train of women and children, old and infirm, would have only facilitated the success of a chief like Malik Shah and would have told heavily against the Franks.

But the internecine warfares and brutal feuds which more than once flooded the Moslem States with waves of blood and checked the progress of the Moslem armies are solely responsible for all the defeats which the Crusaders inflicted on them. At the time of the Crusades Asia Minor, as we have already mentioned, was in the hands of Kilig. Arslan, the son of Suleiman, and the North of Syria under the Prince *Kemischtechin*. This prince belonged to the dynasty of Danishmend. Its founder was a certain Tailu, who, as runs the legend, was a schoolmaster; from whom his descendants took the title of Danishmend.

The early history of this dynasty is shrouded in mystery, but it is probable that after the death of *Suleiman* the members of this dynasty took Sivas, Tokhat, Nicsar, Ablastan, and Malatiah. At the time of the first Crusade, *Kemischtechin* was the ruler, and it was he who took Bohemond prisoner.² In Mesopotamia there were similar disorders. Kerboga, who was appointed the Governor of

¹ *Bibliothèque des Croisades*, tom. iv. pp. 1-4.

² Ordric has coupled a beautiful legend with the release of Bohemond.—Guizot, *Mémoires*, tom. xxviii. pp. 122-140. But Ibn-al-Atir is perhaps more trustworthy on this point. He says that in the year 1102 Bohemond recovered his liberty by means of 100,000 pieces of gold.—Reinaud, *Bibliothèque*, tom. iv. p. 17.

Mossul, declared himself independent. In Syria the confusion was immense. Of the two sons of Tutush, the elder, Rhedwan, established himself at Aleppo; the younger, Dukak, took possession of Damascus. The arms of these two brothers were turned against each other,* and so blind was their hatred that, when Bagi Sian, the Commander of Antioch, asked the help of the Moslem Emirs against the Franks, Rhedwan refused his aid, because his brother Dukak had joined Bagi-Sian.

There were other principalities: *Geinauddaulah* held under him Emesa; Bagi Sian, Antioch; and *Eacr'el Molc Ibn, Ammar Tripoli*.

A fact which further illustrates the unhappy divisions which prevailed amongst the Moslems may be cited here. Although Togdekin of Damascus and Ammar of Tripoli repeatedly applied to the Sultan of Persia for help, it was only after several fruitless appeals that he at last consented to assist the Moslems of Syria.

A well-disciplined Turkish troop was sent under a certain *Givali Scaru*; but, instead of concentrating the different forces of the Moslem Emirs and directing them against the Franks, the Sultan preferred to attack Gekermish, who had followed Kerboga in the principality of Mossul. At a time when Christian Europe was aiming at the destruction of the Moslems, this was a singular error of policy. Gekermish, indeed, was slain; but the Franks received no check from the Sultan of Persia.

Thus, since the Moslems were divided among themselves, and were seeking each other's fall, we need not wonder at the brilliant success of the first Crusade.

S. KHUDA BUKHSH.

NAPOLEON'S ENGLISH TRANSLATOR.

"THE English are a nation of shopkeepers" was a favourite remark of the great Napoleon, but this does not prove he was the inventor of it. The words frequently appear in political articles contributed by Antoine Jay to the Parisian Imperialist journals in the early years of the nineteenth century, and it is quite probable that the modern Cæsar first "read it in the papers," like many of his more commonplace subjects. Antoine Jay coached his Imperial master on public opinion in England for some years, and what probably struck the translator was the preponderance of commercial advertisements in the London newspapers over those inserted in the Parisian newspapers. This may have been the origin of the often-quoted words.

Antoine Jay's knowledge of English was not acquired on this side of the Channel, but in the then newly-formed United States of America. He left his native France in 1795, and remained seven years in the New World. Antoine Jay was only twenty-five years of age when he landed in Canada, and after a short sojourn there proceeded to the western states, Florida and St. Louis. He soon became acquainted with many distinguished American statesmen, and was favoured with the friendship of Jefferson. He was first engaged on a French American journal, and after contributed frequently to the papers published in the English language. Antoine Jay returned to France in 1802, with the intention of becoming an advocate at the French Courts of Justice; and in his leisure hours contributed some articles on his American travels to the *Nouveau Journal des Voyages*. The articles attracted the attention of an old schoolmaster, who wrote to his pupil offering him the position of tutor to his children. The former schoolmaster was Fouché, who had become Minister of the Police. Antoine Jay accepted the post, and also embarked on a literary career. His first volume was a "Tableau Littéraire du 18e Siècle," which was awarded the first prize offered by the French Academy. Savary, who was afterwards created Duc de Rovigo, in course of time introduced Antoine Jay to Napoleon, and recommended him as a suitable person to translate extracts from the English newspapers. Napoleon was anxious to read the comments and criticisms of the London journalists on himself, and the post of translator was a remunerative one. Antoine

Jay received a packet of London papers every evening, and his duty was to translate all the paragraphs and articles on Napoleon and his foreign policy. The translations were laid on the Imperial breakfast-table every morning. The Emperor was so satisfied with the work that he confided to the translator the charge of editing the official *Journal de Paris*. The leading articles were either inspired by Napoleon or submitted to him for "correction" before publication. In fact, Antoine Jay occupied a similar position on the paper as the editor of the late Prince Bismarck's journal, the *Hamburger Nachrichten*. The favoured translator was also appointed about the same period Professor of History at the *Athénée* of Paris, and became a member of the *Chambre des Représentants* shortly before the overthrow of Napoleon. After the restoration of the Bourbons, Antoine Jay was advised by his former protector, Fouché, to abandon Napoleonic principles. The protégé declined, and Fouché and Jay were ever afterwards decided enemies. The English translator of Napoleon made no secret of his sympathies, and was often threatened with prosecution. He was, however, humane enough to afford his protection to the persecuted Royalists after the return of Napoleon from the island of Elba and the "Hundred Days" Government. This is the reason why he was seldom molested during the short reign of Louis XVIII., and only suffered one month's imprisonment. Soon after the passing away of the great Emperor in the miserable island of St. Helena, Antoine Jay undertook what he considered the sacred duty of his life. He corresponded with Napoleon's few faithful generals and friends, and invited them to write their reminiscences and recollections of the modern Cæsar. Several sent valuable contributions. They were published in a series of volumes, and Antoine Jay contributed a "Vie de Napoléon." The motto on every title-page was Napoleon's own significant words: "Je lègue l'opprobre de ma mort à la maison régnante d'Angleterre." Antoine Jay, like many old Bonapartists, heartily welcomed the Revolution of 1830, and was for some years a firm literary champion of the government of Louis Philippe. His enthusiasm, however, gradually declined after the transportation of the remains of the great Napoleon from St. Helena to Paris. He was also suspected by the supporters of the Orleans family, and subsequent events proved that he secretly corresponded with the future Emperor Napoleon III. Antoine Jay lived to witness the revival of the French Empire, and died in his eighty-fourth year at Chambreville, on April 9, 1854. This was during the Crimean crisis, and the old man never could understand the rising enthusiasm in France in favour of the English, and the political alliance arranged by the Governments of the nephew of Napoleon I. and the niece of George IV. Antoine Jay was a prolific writer on many subjects, and was elected a member of the French Academy in 1832. He was the

author of a valuable *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu*, and translated Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*. He wrote also some charming essays under the signature of "Nicolas Freeman," a pen name he used in early life in the United States. He was one of the few French literary men of his time who were able to read the works of Shakespeare, Spencer, Byron, and Shelley in the original language; but by a curious stroke of irony, he was also one of the earliest opponents of the revival of the romantic movement in France. He considered Victor Hugo and the elder Alexandre Dumas dangerous innovators. He learnt the English language across the Atlantic, and the children of his early American friends were always certain of a hearty welcome at Chambreville. He was also always polite and considerate to visitors from this side of the Channel, but he never had any love for England and English institutions. He never could forget the Napoleonic words: "Je lègue l'opprobre de ma mort à la maison régnante d'Angleterre." Singularly enough, Napoleon and his faithful translator borrowed from each other their favourite exclamations against England. We may search history in vain for a parallel coincidence.

ANDREW DE TERNANT.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

Not many years ago experimental psychology could hardly be said to exist; those experiments which were made were crude and inconclusive, and the results obtained from them scarcely sufficed even for the foundation of a science. Now, however, we have not only delicate instruments of great precision, but also elaborate treatises upon their use, with the aid of which important scientific results are being obtained. What will undoubtedly be the standard work on the subject is now being published by the Macmillan Co., the second part of the first volume having just appeared.¹ In this part of his work Mr. E. B. Titchener describes the qualitative tests made in connection with the various sensations, together with the instruments used in each case. The descriptions and illustrations are clear and concise, and with their aid teachers of psychology should be able to obtain some very valuable data.

Under the title of *Origin and Dissolution of the World as a Cosmic Continuous Process*,² Herr J. G. Vogt has published a work which, although nominally a second edition of a smaller book with a different title, is in reality a new collection of essays on various subjects. Many of these have but little connection with the title; for instance, we can hardly find why the chapter on ethics, with its extremely crude socialism, should have found a place in a work of this kind. The author calls a workman a "wage-slave," and is under the impression that all armies exist for the purpose of shooting down these "wage-slaves," and not for the defence of their respective countries. The only country in which slavery is unknown is China, and by adopting the Chinese system of competitive examinations the "wage-slaves" would be able to arm themselves and put an end to the supposed tyranny of an armed minority. Recent events in China hardly support this view. Herr Vogt's ideas on economic matters are equally primitive and show a very scanty knowledge of the subject. The old fiction of an opium war by England against China is repeated, and we are seriously told that Great Britain has been obliged to plant tea in India and Ceylon because our trade

¹ *Experimental Psychology*. By E. B. Titchener. Vol. I. Part II. "Instructor's Manual." London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1901.

² *Entstehen und Vergehen der Welt als kosmischer Kreisprozess*. Zweite Auflage. Von J. G. Vogt. Leipzig: E. Wiest. London: Williams & Norgate. 1901.

with China does not suffice to procure tea in sufficient quantities from that country. There are several other chapters the omission of which would add materially to the value of the book, and it is only when we reach that portion dealing with the matter indicated in the title that we begin to derive some advantage from its perusal. With regard to the origin of the earth from a nebulous mass, Herr Vogt is substantially in accord with previous writers. All initiative is derived from the mechanical properties of matter without any external influence being exercised. When we come to the stage at which the solid crust of the earth began to form there is much divergence of opinion among different authors. Herr Vogt's theories are not quite in accordance with known chemical facts, although some of them are suggestive, and may, when thoroughly worked out, throw some light upon the reactions which took place. It is a little difficult for any one familiar with modern petrography to imagine that gneiss has been formed by alternate showers of mica and felspar crystals from the atmosphere. If such a temperature prevailed that either of these minerals were volatilised, they would first condense into a state of igneous fusion, felspar being an excellent flux. The idea that calcic carbonate remained inert while all silicates were deposited and silica in the free state still existed is at variance with the most elementary chemical facts. More interesting is that part of the book dealing with the origin of life upon the earth. Put very briefly, Herr Vogt's opinion is that life can only develop upon a planet, because one of the necessary conditions is the alternation of temperature caused by solar radiation. Of the final fate of mankind, when gigantic ice-caps advance towards the equator, the author draws a gloomy picture; but here again we may remark that all the evidence at our disposal shows that the glacial periods have been very partial, and that high rather than low temperatures have hitherto prevailed.

It had long been known to the friends of the late Dr. Heddle that he had for many years been preparing materials for a work on the mineralogy of Scotland. An experience of more than fifty years in the collection of minerals rendered it particularly desirous that Dr. Heddle's results should not be lost to science, and we are greatly indebted to his son-in-law, Mr. A. Thoms, for having collected and published the notes and drawings which had been partly prepared for that purpose. Most posthumous works are of a somewhat sketchy nature and too often betray a dual authorship; but in the present instance Mr. Thoms has done his work so admirably that the two volumes before us¹ leave nothing to be desired either as regards arrangement or subject-matter. When we add that the numerous figures and diagrams are executed in the best possible

¹ *The Mineralogy of Scotland.* By the late M. F. Heddle, M.D. Edited by J. G. Goodchild. Edinburgh: D. Douglas. 1901.

manner, it will be seen that every possible effort has been made to do justice to Dr. Heddle's work. Although it is well known that Scotland is rich in minerals, one can scarcely realise how rich it is until one studies a work of this kind. When a vein of auriferous quartz was accidentally discovered a short time ago it was imagined by many that this was the first indication of that precious metal. There are, however, many localities known to be auriferous, and, under more favourable mining laws, would probably be worked. In Lanarkshire alone gold to the value of £200,000 was found in the reign of James V. Silver also occurs in many places; one mine alone, at Alva, yielded £50,000 worth of silver in five years. The preservation of game over wide areas and the right of the Crown to precious metals no doubt prevent the development of the rich resources of the country. Dr. Heddle's remarks on the various varieties of agate are extremely instructive, and, accompanied as they are by numerous excellent illustrations, they form a complete treatise on the subject. On the whole, the book is of great value to the mineralogist and geologist and forms a fitting memorial to its author.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

MR. BABINGTON modestly calls his work on *The Reformation a Religious and Historical Sketch*; ¹ it is rather a masterly survey of the greatest religious movement in history. Mr. Babington does not pretend to offer any new facts, nor does he trouble the reader with documents and references to authorities. He takes the knowledge of these for granted, and upon the accepted basis of history he founds his review and summary of the movement known as the Protestant Reformation. In a preliminary sketch he describes the miserable condition of the Christian Church, which called loudly for reform; the ignorance, superstition, worldliness, covetousness and vice which permeated all religious institutions, not in one or two places, but everywhere. We are then shown how the intellect and conscience of Christendom revolted against this state of things, and religion, learning, and politics all combined in furthering the work of reform. Mr. Babington lucidly shows the different lines the Reformation followed in different countries, and to what extent it was affected by differences of circumstances and the characteristics of

¹ *The Reformation: a Religious and Historical Sketch.* By the Rev. J. A. Babington, M.A. London: John Murray. 1901.

its leaders. It was incited or directed by men of distinctive character like Erasmus, Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, Knox, and the English Reformers. Great ecclesiastical and theological differences prevailed amongst the Reformers themselves, but the general result was the same: the overthrow, in those countries where the Reformation succeeded, of the authority as well as the corruptions of the Roman and Papal Church. There is a growing tendency amongst an influential party in England to minimise the importance of the Reformation, and Mr. Babington has rendered a real service, not only to Protestantism, but to Christianity, by his forcible and judicial survey of the principles and aims of the Reformers of which the present generation needs to be reminded. The story is told in a clear and interesting style which never wearies the reader, and with an absence of controversial heat which is striking.

Sensible religious teachers generally come to the conclusion, sooner or later, to make the best of changes which they cannot prevent, and even to accept with thankfulness critical results which were at first denounced as dangerous heresies. *The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews*,¹ by Dr. Lyman Abbott, is an interesting illustration of this spirit. Dr. Abbott accepts without hesitation all the results of what is called the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament, a phrase of which he gives a very intelligent and correct explanation. We fully agree with our author that historical and literary criticism has made the Old Testament a far more interesting book than it formerly was, when it was regarded as an infallible revelation full of irritating perplexities. Dr. Abbott's aim is simply to popularise the work of experts and set forth in a manner to interest the ordinary religious reader the results of their investigations. But there is a distinct originality and literary interest in this work when the writer deals with such books as Job, the Song of Songs, and the Psalms of David. His criticism is perfectly free and his expositions untainted by dogmatic preferences. This book is a healthy sign of the times.

The ninth volume of the Messages of the Bible, edited by Professors F. K. Saunders and C. F. Kent, treats of the first three Gospels under the cumbrous title of *The Messages of Jesus*² according to the Synoptists; *The Discourses of Jesus in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, arranged as far as feasible in the order of time, and freely rendered into Paraphrase* by Thomas Cuming Hall, D.D. The title-pages are provoking. Yale University we have heard of, but what is "Brown University," where Dr. Kent "professes"? or "Union Theological Seminary," where Dr. T. C. Hall has a chair? And why arranged as far as "feasible"? Would not "practicable"

¹ *The Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews.* By Lyman Abbott. London: James Clarke & Co.

² *The Messages of Jesus according to the Synoptists.* By Thomas Cuming Hall, D.D. London: James Clarke & Co.

be more appropriate? Is there no scholar who can invent a better term to indicate Matthew, Mark, and Luke than "the Synoptists"? The term is well understood by students, but we are badly in want of one for the general public and ordinary congregations.

Dr. Hall tells us that his endeavour has been to give, so far as possible, the very words of Jesus: then why was he not satisfied, if he had gained the very words of Jesus, to present them to the reader instead of paraphrasing them fully? Instead of the words of Jesus we often have only the words of Dr. Hall. Is the "Divine Order" an improvement on the "Kingdom of Heaven"? Jesus said, "Be not anxious for the morrow"; Dr. Hall makes him say, "Do not worry too much about the future." Is such a paraphrase worth the trouble?

The writer has something of the critical spirit, but it does not go far, and we think labour is wasted in trying to harmonise or synchronise the three Gospels. The labour and learning expended over this little book might have been more effectually employed on each Gospel separately; in the present form they are to a great extent thrown away.

The growing interest in the new views of the Bible resulting from the labours of scholars and critics is shown by an admirable essay by Mr. W. A. Leonard, entitled *The New Story of the Bible*,¹ issued by the Rationalist Press Association. Mr. Leonard very ably summarises the results of the investigations of scholars like Wellhausen and Harnack, Cheyne Hatch and Driver, and by showing the historical relation of the various books and their natural human origin, brings them within the range of the ordinary understanding. One great gain of this new view of the Bible is that it relieves us of many moral and religious difficulties which are inseparable from the view that the whole of the Bible was divinely inspired; and upon this Mr. Leonard very wisely insists. At present the old view is unfortunately still widely held, but it is disappearing as the new view becomes better known. Mr. Leonard's essay will help to spread light upon the subject, and we hope it will obtain a wide circulation.

"Short and sensible" is a fair description of an essay *On Human Nature as an Excuse for Sin*,² by Dr. M. C. Hime. The author's definition of sin would not, perhaps, satisfy theologians, but it is in accordance with rational ethics: "Whatsoever is not done with the full conviction that it may be lawfully and rightly done, the man being entirely persuaded in his own mind that there is nothing wrong whatever in doing it, is sin to the man who does it." The

¹ *The New Story of the Bible*. By William A. Leonard. London: Watts & Co.

² *On Human Nature as an Excuse for Sin*. An Essay addressed to Christians. By Maurice C. Hime, LL.D. London: J. & A. Churchill and the White Cross League. Dublin: E. Ponsonby.

author's contention is that we ought not to do what our better nature or conscience disapproves ; but conscience requires educating as much as our other faculties. There are many striking thoughts in this essay which should be of great service to young people.

We have received several pamphlets on Church questions, and can recommend the following : *A Defence of the King's Protestant Declaration*, by Walter Walsh (London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co.) ; *The Nation and the National Church*, by a Somerset Churchwarden (Taunton : Barnicott & Pearce) ; and *The Last Step to Religious Equality*, by Edmund Kell Blythe (London : T. Fisher Unwin).

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

MR. JOSIAH OLDFIELD comes to the consideration of *The Penalty of Death*¹ with the double qualifications of the lawyer and the physician. He fully proves his case that the diminution in the severity of punishment has been accompanied by a more than corresponding decrease in crime. But he goes too far in connecting those two facts as cause and effect. Over-severity, as society learnt to its cost, proved no deterrent of crime. In fact, it proved rather the reverse, since, as public opinion became more humane, juries refused to convict. Capital punishment for a long list of trivial offences was abolished, partly because it was uncertain, and so was less deterrent, and partly because, owing to the increasing material prosperity of the nation, the motives for such offences became less powerful, and with the mass of the people had ceased altogether. As Professor Ferri, whose disciple Mr. Oldfield professes to be, has clearly shown, improve the material-social and political condition of the people and you at once cut away the usual motives for crime.

It is upon the ground of humanity that Mr. Oldfield advocates the abolition of the death penalty. But in endeavouring to show that life imprisonment, with its horrors of seclusion, is more deterrent than capital punishment, and that many seek escape from it by suicide, as Bresci did the other day, he proves too much. Capital punishment is the more humane. Life imprisonment is mere torture long drawn out.

It is perfectly true that with the unpremeditated murderer

¹ *The Penalty of Death ; or, The Problem of Capital Punishment.* By Josiah Oldfield, M.A., B.C.L. (Oxon.) and R.C.P., M.R.C.S. (England). London : George Bell and Sons. 1901.

nothing acts as a deterrent; the man, for the nonce, has lost his self-control and is, in fact, insane. But, in spite of all Mr. Oldfield's statistics, death is still the greatest deterrent. There is nothing that appeals more strongly to the average healthy man. It is impossible to prove the effect of the fear of death, for it is largely negative in its operation, but we may safely assume that it has prevented many a crime.

Mr. Oldfield admits that certain punishments were necessary at certain periods of a nation's evolution; so with the individual only certain punishments appeal. For criminal assaults upon women and children, for instance, in our opinion the punishment might with advantage be increased. A man who commits such crimes can scarcely be more brutalised by the application of the cat, and it is the only thing that such scoundrels dread next to the death penalty.

Mr. Oldfield is on safer ground when he agrees with Lombroso in considering that all crime is a manifestation of mental disease and is usually atavistic. Why not, then, treat criminals and lunatics alike? Why not, indeed? It is impossible to draw a line between a criminal and a lunatic. Both are degenerates, and, according to the Italian School, both should be put out of the way at birth. It appears to us to be more humane to put to death murderers and other criminal lunatics than to keep them alive to be a source of danger, expense and trouble to the community and a burden to themselves. Whatever views of this highly controversial question may be taken, Mr. Oldfield's book will be read with profit and interest.

Japan's Accession to the Comity of Nations,¹ by Baron Alexander von Siebold, is a thoroughly readable and informing little work. The story of the extraordinary transition of a mediæval State to the position of a first-class Western Power in the short space of thirty years is told with a few bold and rapid strokes. The main object of the author, however, is to describe the diplomatic struggle of Japan to enter upon equal terms into the fellowship of the Western Powers, a position hitherto denied to all non-Christian States. This was only rendered possible by Japan giving satisfactory proof of its ability to treat aliens in accordance with Western legal conceptions. To secure this recognition of its international rights the Japanese Government had to encounter the national prejudices of the party to which it looked for its chief support. It was obliged to throw open its trade and commerce throughout the empire on the usual terms of international intercourse. It is only fair, however, to point out that this proposal came first from Japan, a proof of the political courage and foresight of her progressive statesmen.

¹ *Japan's Accession to the Comity of Nations.* By Baron Alexander von Siebold. Translated from the German. With an Introduction by Charles Lowe, M.A. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd. 1901.

In Baron von Siebold we have a reliable writer of the first order. The son of a distinguished German scientist and Eastern pioneer, he has passed the greater part of his life in the country of his adoption, and the whole of it in the diplomatic service, first of England, and finally of Japan. It would be difficult to find any one better qualified for the task he has undertaken.

There is, perhaps, no period of European history of more absorbing interest than that covered by the Thirty Years War. *Le Peuple Allemand à l'époque de la Guerre de Trente Ans*¹ will therefore be welcomed by French readers and others unable to read German. The book before us consists of extracts from the great work of Gustave Freytag, *Bilder aus der Deutschen Vergangenheit*, translated and systematically arranged by M. Aimé Mercier. These extracts deal with the social life of the various German peoples at the time of the Thirty Years War.

Freytag is intensely popular in Germany, where he essentially represents the Imperialist and patriotic school of writers. He especially excels in describing the domestic life of the German people, their struggles, their pleasures, their sufferings, and their aspirations. He is equally at home in the field with the conflicting armies, and in the city or in the village, and with the same clearness of vision he examines the condition of their minds and the motives for their conduct. Herr Freytag can be powerful, original, and even passionate without ceasing to be judicial. Upon a sound basis of fact he rebuilds and brings into high relief the life of the German people as it was when the seventeenth century was young and at *le point de départ* of a great and unfortunate social upheaval. Whether for scientific research or for historical erudition, this work will appeal to all students of this period of European history. M. Mercier has performed his task with remarkable ability and discrimination.

We have received the *Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for the Year 1899, with Statistics of Local Governing Bodies for the Year ended March 31, 1900*.² This volume is comprised in the *New Zealand Official Year-Book for 1900*, which we have already noticed, and it is therefore unnecessary to do more than call attention to the great value to English economists of these *Statistics*.

¹ *Le Peuple Allemand à l'époque de la Guerre de Trente Ans*. D'après Gustave Freytag. Traduction par Aimé Mercier. Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1901.

² *Statistics of the Colony of New Zealand for the Year 1899*. Compiled in the Registrar-General's Office from Official Records. By Authority. Wellington: John Mackay, Government Printer. 1900.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE biography of *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham*,¹ by Mr. Walford Davis Green, is perhaps the most interesting volume in the "Heroes of the Nations" series. England has produced no more sincere or devoted statesman than Chatham. His attitude with regard to the American War of Independence showed his unflinching courage—the rarest courage in a politician, for it is the courage that even faces the risk of unpopularity. The account of the elder Pitt's career as a War Minister is masterly and exhaustive. It is shown that Burke, in spite of his greatness, did injustice to a statesman who was just as sterling a patriot as himself. Indeed, in the grand closing scene of his life, when Chatham came down to the House with the pallor of death on his face—just as Grattan did in Ireland—to protest against injustice and political degradation, the heroic figure of the great man looms gigantic. This book should be read by all who are interested in the growth of the British Empire. It shows what true Imperialism means, as distinguished from the bastard Imperialism of which the late Lord Beaconsfield was the prophet, and which is embodied to-day in the blatant Jingoism of Mr. Chamberlain and his henchmen. Chatham, in spite of a certain tinge of histrionism, due to his oratoric genius, was thoroughly in earnest in his desire to save the Empire from dismemberment. Were he living now, his clarion voice would be the first to denounce the insane war in South Africa.

The wonderful careers of the Scottish family of Gregory (descended from the Macgregors of Roro) may be regarded as a proof—or a partial proof—of the theory of hereditary talent. In the volume of the "Famous Scots" series recently published,² justice is done to the academic achievements of this family. It is a curious fact that, while Rob Roy proudly defied human law, some of his kindred were helping to educate the youth of Scotland in the "higher humanities." In this volume will be found a series of family portraits in which all Scotsmen should take pride. The Gregories were exceptionally gifted both as mathematicians and physicians.

*The Memoirs of Arthur Laurenson*³ is the title of a most interesting volume dealing with the life of a man who, living in remote Shetland, was a keen student of Scandinavian literature and a

¹ *William Pitt (Earl of Chatham)*. ("Heroes of the Nations.") By Walford Davis Green. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

² *The Academic Gregories*. ("Famous Scots.") By Agnes Grainger Stewart. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier.

³ *The Memoirs of Arthur Laurenson: His Letters and Literary Remains*. Edited by Catherine Stafford Spence. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

scholar of no mean attainments. The essay on the "Old Norse Literature and Language" shows Mr. Laurenson's profound knowledge of a subject about which the reading public knows much too little. His admiration for the Norse race is pardonably enthusiastic, even though it may err on the side of exaggeration. The volume is carefully and cleverly edited by Catherine Stafford Spence.

*Les Blés d'Iiver*¹ contains M. Joseph Reinach's able history of the latest phases of the Dreyfus case. His view is that the convulsion caused by the ill-treatment of Dreyfus is a proof of France's passionate love of justice. While he condemns the machinations of Dreyfus' dastardly enemies, he claims that the cause of justice is triumphing, and that Dreyfus will have the great glory not only of vindicating himself but of purifying French public life.

Mr. W. Pugin Thornton has, in an interesting little pamphlet, discussed the question whether the bones found in the crypt of Canterbury Cathedral in January 1888 were those of Archbishop Thomas Becket.² He gives solid reasons for coming to the conclusion that they were, including the orderly interment of the bones, their great age, and their unusual size, Becket having been a very tall man. The illustrations add to the clearness and convincingness of Mr. Thornton's argument.

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. EDEN PHILPOTTS has written a charming Devonshire story. *The Good Red Earth*³ reminds us of some of Mr. Hardy's earlier novels. It is manifestly written under the direct inspiration of Nature. Of the plot we must acknowledge that it is somewhat hackneyed, and it certainly sins against probability. It is in the purely rural scenes that Mr. Philpotts shines. The character of the sanctimonious rascal, Alpheus Newte, is not drawn from life. It is an ingenious specimen of the manufacture of *dramatis personæ* out of the author's

¹ *Les Blés d'Iiver*. Par Joseph Reinach. Paris: F. V. Stock.

² *Becket's Bones*. By W. Pugin Thornton. Canterbury: Cross & Jackman.

³ *The Good Red Earth*. By Eden Philpotts. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

inner consciousness. However, the artificiality of the plot may be forgiven on account of the fresh, sweet naturalness of the author's descriptions of Devonshire scenery. Mr. Philpotts shows a true love of the country and an appreciation of the charms of rustic life. We may regard him as an earnest disciple of Thomas Hardy, the most deep-hearted and natural of living English novelists.

*The Melita of the Midlands*¹ is a funny book, in which an ex-rector treats religion and religious controversy as simply subjects for broad jests. There is some rich though vulgar humour in the volume.

Professor Tyrrell has won a very high place amongst the classical scholars of the age. His *Anthology of Latin Poetry*² is an admirably edited volume. It contains specimens of pre-Hellenic poetry, and extracts from the works of Terence, Lucretius, Horace, Juvenal, Virgil, Ovid, Propertius, Plantus, Martial, and many other Latin poets. The notes are exceedingly judicious. In the case of authors universally read, Professor Tyrrell has deemed it unnecessary to have any notes, while in dealing with authors which have not been largely explained in English, such notes are given as are adapted to the higher forms of a Public School.

The edition of the Twenty-Second Book of *Livy*,³ issued in the University Tutorial Series, will be found to answer all the requirements of students. The introduction contains a sketch of the historian's life as well as an account of the second Punic War. The notes contain a close and accurate explanation of all the difficulties of the text.

*Le Cilice*⁴ is unquestionably a subtle study of the female heart, and M. Maurice Paléologue has written, if not exactly a masterpiece, a very powerful novel. Madame de Brienne, a beautiful and charming woman united to an unloved husband, conceives a deep attachment to Henri Vaudrec, a celebrated Parisian writer. Her love remains, however, chaste and spiritual until, after she had witnessed her lover's inconstancy, she is in a moment of weakness robbed of her crown of virtue. The *dénouement* is startlingly dramatic and exceedingly sad.

M. Louis Lumet is a writer of remarkable power and originality. His volume, *Le Chaos*,⁵ forming the second part of the tetralogy, *Un Jeune Homme dans la Société*, brings before us most vividly the

¹ *The Melita of the Midlands*. By an ex-Rector. London: Watts & Co.

² *Anthology of Latin Poetry*. By Robert Selverton Tyrrell, Litt.D. London: Macmillan & Co.

³ *Livy*. Book xxii. Edited by James Thompson, M.A. Camb., and F. G. Bristow, M.A. Lond. and Camb. London: W. B. Clive (The University Tutorial Press).

⁴ *Le Cilice*. Par Maurice Paléologue. Paris: Librairie Plon.

⁵ *Le Chaos*. Par Louis Lumet. Paris: P. V. Stock.

struggles, the weaknesses, and the enthusiasms of young men in Paris. Louis Lumet is an intensely human, natural character, palpitating with life and passion. Even in the hour of degradation he redeems himself by a revolt against materialism and animality. The work is one of the finest specimens of contemporary French fiction.

Those who love a simple story of rustic life should read Mr. Christopher Hare's charming tale, *The Life-Story of Dinah Kellow*.¹ The opening scene, in which poor Jenny Kellow is described breaking stones to support her illegitimate child, is deeply pathetic. The whole tone of the narrative is perhaps rather too sombre. Of the other stories in the volume, "Home to Cuckoo Corner" and "A Case of Sentiment" are the best. The author understands English country life thoroughly. He has some of the naturalness, though little of the magic, of Thomas Hardy. The volume will repay perusal, and will be appreciated by all who love to study "the short and simple annals of the poor."

The Dream-Woman,² by Kythe Wylwynne, is an extraordinary story of the "impossible" kind. Merle Morne Merne is a sculptor who has a vision of a strangely fascinating woman, and finds the embodiment of the vision in Maris, the girl whom he marries. The conception of the Dream City and the account of the search for it reminds us of Mr. Rider Haggard's *She*. There is some cleverness in the story, though fiction of this kind is certainly not of a high order. Mr. Rider Haggard struck a new vein in the realms of literary excavation, but it was not a vein of gold. It is to be regretted that the author of *The Dream-Woman* should not have found a better field for the exercise of his imaginative powers. If the story is to be regarded as a pure allegory or "dream," so much the better; but, even in that case, the narrative, by its extravagance and cumbrousness, offends our sense of ethical harmony. A whole world of thought and ideas separates works of this sort from *The Pilgrim's Progress*. Indeed, it is most desirable to discourage the species of literary extravaganza based on the idea of buried treasures and resurrected corpses.

It would be hard to bestow excessive praise on Heinrich Balthaupt's admirable volume, *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*.³ The study of Ibsen is a splendid example of minute and searching criticism. The genius of Ibsen is acknowledged, while his defects are not ignored. The essay on Sudermann is also luminous and convincing. The allusions to greater dramatists, such as Shakespeare, Calderon,

¹ *The Life-Story of Dinah Kellow*. By Christopher Hare. London: Ward, Lock and Co.

² *The Dream-Woman*. By Kythe Wylwynne. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

³ *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*. Von Heinrich Balthaupt. Oldenburg und Leipzig. Schulzische Hof. Buchhandlung und Buchdruckerei.

and Goethe, are judicious and instructive. Herr Bultaupt is one of the ablest living writers on dramatic literature.

Les Aventures de Nono,¹ by Jean Grave, is a work of real originality—almost of genius. We have nothing exactly like it in English, though in some respects it might be compared to *Alice in Wonderland*. It cannot be put on a level with *Gulliver's Travels*, for that great work combines all the qualities of a satire, an allegory, and a psychological study. Nono is a little boy of nine. He is rather self-willed and spoiled by his fond parents. He asks one night for a beautifully illustrated story-book. He goes to sleep, dreams of fairies, and wakes up in a strange country where he finds friends amongst the bees and where he soon meets other children, who become his playmates and friends. His subsequent journey to Monnaïa, which is an allegoric picture of some great Western city like London or Paris, his arrest for disobedience to cruel laws, and his sentence of imprisonment for life, are described with much vivacity. The story will delight young and old. The illustrations are excellent.

*Ueber Chinélilches Theater*² is the title of a deeply interesting booklet by Herr von Minnegerode. It is marvellous how many subjects have attracted the indefatigable brain-workers of Germany. The world owes a great debt of gratitude to the Germans for their wonderful and untiring research. The Chinese drama is not as old as one might expect. It is, however, more venerable than the English drama. It is realistic in a somewhat grotesque sense, and, in England or France, would probably produce boredom—or sleep! The little volume will repay perusal.

*L'un et l'autre*³ is a novel dealing with the woman question. The ideas which animate the heroine, Armande, are not unlike those embodied in Sarah Grand's works. The idea that a man insults a woman by regarding her as his property, to be protected for its material value and fought for, is somewhat curious, though by no means new. The story is told with admirable piquancy and vividness. The author, M. Henry C. Moreau, claims to have drawn his materials from actual life.

The *Matriculation Directory*,⁴ issued by University Correspondence College, for January 1901, contains the report of the work done during the past year, showing the praiseworthy efforts of the

¹ *Les Aventures de Nono*. Par Jean Grave. Illustrations par A. Charpentier, &c. Paris: P. V. Stock.

² *Ueber Chinélilches Theater*. Von Minnegerode. Oldenburg und Leipzig: Scultzesche Hof-Buchhandlung und Hof-Buchdruckerei.

³ *L'un et l'autre*. Par Henry C. Moreau. Paris: Librairie Plon.

⁴ *Matriculation Directory*. No. XXIX. January 1901. Burlington House, Cambridge. London Office: 52 Red Lion Square, Holborn, W.C.

University Tutorial Press in the issue of text-books, and also gives a list of subjects for examination and the works selected for the purpose. The Directory will be very useful to students.

POETRY.

MR. SYDNEY ROYSE LYSAGHT has shown that he has the "great poetic heart," which, according to Tennyson, is "more than all poetic fame." His volume of verse, entitled *Poems of the Unknown Way*,¹ contains much that will appeal to the feelings of the young and ardent. "The Lost World" is really an exquisite poem. As it is short, we give it in its entirety :

'Vast, we saw, when the sun was low,
A trackless forest where none may roam ;
But 'twas not so vast as a wood we know
Across three fields from the house at home.

We saw the peaks of eternal snow,
The summits that foot of man ne'er clomb ;
But they're not so high as a hill we know
At the lonely end of a moor at home.

Cities we entered with lights aglow,
On many a palace, many a dome ;
But they're not so grand as a port we know,
When the ships come in from the sea at home.

For the seas grow narrow, the hills fall low,
And the world is small when its bounds you know ;
But the wonderful world we used to know
Is still out over the hills at home."

Sometimes, as in "A Confession of Faith," Mr. Lysaght strikes a more ambitious note ; but we prefer the pure lyricism of the verses we have quoted.

The first half of the nineteenth century saw more than one

¹ *Poems of the Unknown Way*. By Sydney Royse Lysaght. London : Macmillan and Co. Ltd.

unhappy poet whose untimely death has withered in the spring trees which were promising a most bounteous harvest of good things. Doubtless the most unhappy of all was Giacomo Leopardi, the Italian poet, for it may almost be said that he carried his unhappiness from the cradle to the grave without any interval of true joy. On the occasion of the poet's first centenary the Italian literature was enriched with many publications touching on Leopardi's life, works, and times. The last, but by no means the least,¹ is by far the most interesting contribution to the *letteratura leopardina*. Signor Michele Scherillo has, as one may say, written anew the autobiography of Leopardi, because all the most important points of his life are therein illustrated, with passages from letters the poet wrote to relatives and friends. The principal feature of this autobiographical work is the shifting of the chief responsibility for the great unhappiness of the melancholy and pathetic poet from the shoulders of his father to those of his more despotic mother. Every one who reads Leopardi's *Canti* without these posthumous comments cannot but come to the conclusion that Count Monaldo, the poet's father, was the cause of Leopardi's misery; but the reading of this book leads the reader of Leopardi's *Canti* to another conclusion—viz., that Count Monaldo was not master in his own house, and that he had to obey and carry out the orders of another person—his wife.

Evidently both parents, according to this book, were tyrannical and unjust to their son. The father belonged to the old Papal aristocracy, and at the age of eighteen, as he himself was proud enough to state in his notes, he adopted the black dress of the aristocracy and never wore anything else. His individuality can easily be deduced from the following note written by him: "When Napoleon passed through here (Recanati) I was in the Town Hall; only a few yards separated me from the window; I did not think it was worth my while to take those few steps to see that man passing." The mother was equally reactionary and against the new times. Soon after her marriage she undertook to restore the finances of the family, which were in awful disorder. She achieved her object fully, but in the process she utterly destroyed the life of all her children, by denying them all necessary help away from home. At home the poet could not live, because in the castle of his forefathers he was in a worse position than a bird in a cage.

The character of both the poet and his parents is faithfully and in a very interesting way depicted in this book, which is divided into three parts—first, the poet's life; second, his *Canti*; third,

¹ *Canti di Giacomo Leopardi*. Illustrati dal Signor Michele Scherillo. Editore Ulrico Hoepli. Milan. 1901.

notes and comments on the latter. This book deserves praise both for its contents and for the splendid dress in which the enterprising publisher has presented it to the public. The edition of this book *per se* is a *bijou*. To students of Italian literature Signor Scherillo's book should be an inestimable treasure.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW

VOL. CLVI. No. 2.—AUGUST 1901.

SOUTH AFRICA AND IMPERIALISM.

IN these days of fierce debate, when J. A. Froude's *Oceana* is the text-book of every supporter of the Boer cause, it may surprise some to learn that Mr. Froude was himself an Imperialist. "What?" you ask. "How could he be a pro-Boer, and yet be an Imperialist?" It is very simple.

Froude believed that the inevitable result of the annexation policy would be the establishment of the United States of South Africa, that if the British Government did not deal justly with the Transvaal, South Africa would in the end be lost to the Empire.

In this belief he strove to induce the British people and Government to see the justice and expediency of the retrocession of the Transvaal.

His daughter, Miss Margaret Froude, in the preface to his *Lectures on South Africa*, thinks that her father would have changed his mind if he had lived to our day, had read Mr. Kruger's ultimatum, and had understood the ambitious designs of some of the Boer leaders. I do not think so.

He evidently believed that some of the leading Boers looked forward to a time when a great South African Republic would be formed and the authority of Britain destroyed for ever. Miss Froude does not seem to have read her father's works very carefully. In his *Lectures on South Africa* he refers to the schemes of President Burgers of the Transvaal for the strengthening of that State at the expense of Britain, and in his interview with him he came to the conclusion that President Burgers was no friend to Britain. If the reader turns to page 60 of his *Oceana*, he will find that Mr. Froude says :

"I met afterwards one of those Dutch leaders to whom he (Sir Hercules Robinson) had referred, a cool, determined gentleman, with faultless temper and manners, who knew what he meant himself to do, if no one else knew. The Dutch can abide their time, and wait the issue of our blunders. President Kruger (President of the Transvaal) said to me in London, that every step which the English had taken in South Africa during the last twelve years had been what he would have himself recommended if he had wished the connection with England to be terminated, with the single exception of the admission of wrong which Lord Carnarvon had made to the Orange Free State, and the compensation which he had granted for the Diamond Fields. The effect of that concession had been to keep the Free State back when the Transvaal was fighting for its independence; everything else had been what the most advanced Afrikaner could have desired. I mentioned this to Mr. H——, the gentleman of whom I am speaking. He smiled ominously, as if he was himself of the same opinion. There was no likelihood of the exception being repeated."

I believe that there are few who are at all conversant with South African politics who could not give Mr. H—— his full name without a moment's hesitation.

Let the reader note that sentence, "There was no likelihood of the exception being repeated," and compare it with the preceding passage, and he will see that what is meant is that in the next war with Britain the Orange Free State would assist the Transvaal.

Mr. Froude, with Mr. Kruger and the advanced Afrikaners, evidently believed that if Britain would cease from meddling with the affairs of the Transvaal, the great ideas which were simmering in the minds of the advanced Afrikaners would make little or no progress in South Africa. That is in accordance with what we know of human nature, and especially of Boer human nature. It is also in accordance with what we know of the facts.

The dread of British interference with their independence gradually died out amongst the Boers, and with it their justifiable hatred of this country; and no man who knows anything of the Boers can say that a few advanced Afrikaners could send forth the individualist Boer farmers against Britain unless the farmers were in mortal dread of losing their independence, and were inspired with strong hatred for the British Government. The Jameson Raid naturally alarmed the Boers, and thenceforth the hatred and distrust of the British Government, which had gone down to a low ebb, began to rise; the Transvaal Government took increased precautions, and bought guns and ammunition in great quantities. The Boer Government saw that the war was inevitable, as our phrase is, and was determined to do its best for the Republic. Having considered all circumstances, the Boer chiefs saw that if they were not to be overwhelmed by the British power, they must take the initiative and seize the passes, by which they could best defend their independence.

It is of no use for any one to say that their fears were unjustifiable.

They were justifiable. If a Russian filibustering expedition had landed in this country and had been defeated by us, and if a prominent member of the Russian Government had, whilst disavowing the scheme, publicly defended the character of the statesman who was its inspirer, would it not have been justifiable in us to have greatly increased our military expenditure and to have been thenceforth very wary in our dealings with Russia? Why, the Boers would have been arrant fools if they had not prepared themselves for the struggle. They remembered that when the strong man armed keepeth the house the goods are at peace. How often do our Jingoës tell us, "If you want peace you must prepare for war"? Why, then, do you call the Boers vile names for adopting your own maxim, which I believe to be a sound one?

The so-called plot for the total destruction of the British power in South Africa I believe to be a fiction of the sensational journalist. Froude knew that a few of the leading Afrikaners had the idea in their minds that the British dominion over South Africa was in its nature temporary, and that the time would come when South Africa would set up for herself. In fact, not a few statesmen and politicians amongst ourselves have expressed that idea at different times and in different ways.

Mr. Froude, in his *Lectures on South Africa*, says that the Boers did not understand President Burgers' scheme for the aggrandisement of the Transvaal, and he became so unpopular that he had to resign his office. Quite so.

Further, most of those who profess to believe in the existence of the plot say that the mass of the Boers were misled by their rulers, and believed that they were fighting solely for their independence. What is the case now?

Why, you, my good British Imperialists, have familiarised the mass of the Boers with the grand and noble idea of the United States of South Africa, and henceforth their minds will be turned to the accomplishment of the great work. "Ah! but we have annexed the South African Republic and the Orange Free State, and we need not fear that now."

I tell you, my friends, that by making those sham annexations you have brought the end of the British Empire in South Africa nearer. You have for the first time united Dutchmen, Republicans, and Afrikaners throughout South Africa, and, in the long run, no Power, not even the British, will be able to stand before them. The fall of the British Empire in South Africa is merely a matter of a few years if the present policy of the Government is pursued. You can indefinitely delay that event by agreeing to the independence of the two States, which is the only just policy, as even Miss Margaret Froude confesses in a curious passage. But, sooner or later, I believe that South Africa will be independent; you may,

by war or by conciliation, attempt to stave off that day, but you may be sure of this, that the day will come.

It will be a glorious morning for Britain, for ever since that ill-omened year when she bought the free Dutch burghers and their lands from Holland, she has squandered many millions of money and much good English, Scots, and Irish blood in the attempt to govern a territory which ought never to have been hers. Will this expense ever be repaid to Britain? Never.

South Africa has been a very bad speculation. What have we gained by it? Nothing. No, I am wrong. We have gained something. Yes. We have gained the opprobrium of the world. In Heaven's name, then, let it go; leave it to its own destiny.

Mr. Froude, however, did not desire this consummation. He was, as I have said, an Imperialist, just as W. T. Stead is an Imperialist. It is as much out of fear for the integrity of the Empire as out of the love of justice that Mr. Stead opposes the Government policy. Mr. Froude, like Mr. Stead, did not desire that the British colonies should obtain independence, but he wished for the formation of a great British Federal Parliament in which there should be representatives from all the colonies.

He says, in a notable passage of *Oceana* :

"Supposing that they were independent, they would have their war of classes, their internal revolutions, their dreams of a millennium to be brought about by political convulsions. These are nature's methods for disciplining human character and bringing us to know that life is not all a holiday. Out of such struggles great men have risen and great nations, and, so far as we know, greatness cannot be purchased at any lower price. For the English colonies there is no such school yet opened, nor while they remain attached to us on the present terms can such a school ever be opened. They have no foreign policy, no diplomatists, no intercourse with the political circles in other parts of the world, to call out their intellect or extend their interests beyond their own shores. We have our national concerns to look after and our national risks to run, and therefore our thoughts and anxieties are enlarged. They have none of these interests; their situation does not allow it. They will have good lawyers among them, good doctors, good men of science, engineers, merchants, manufacturers, as the Romans had in the decline of the Empire. But of the heroic type of man, of whom poets will sing and after ages be anxious to read, there will not be so many, when the generation is gone which was born and bred in the old world. Such men are not wanted, and would have no work cut out for them. Happy, it is often said, the country which has no history. Growing nations may pass their childhood in obscurity and amusement, but the neutral condition cannot last for ever. They must emerge out of it in some way, or they might as well never have existed. The rising Australians are promising young men. If they mean to be more, they must either be independent or must be citizens of *Oceana*."

Yes, Mr. Froude, you are right. I agree with you that the British colonies must either be independent or must be represented in the Imperial Parliament.

Let us then examine the scheme of Imperial Federation, and see whether it is feasible or not. The colonies would be represented in the Imperial Parliament, and would therefore have a voice, not only in the making of war and peace, but also in many other matters. They would agree to the imposition of taxes on Britain and Ireland; but when the Government would propose to tax them, as in equity it ought to do, they would rebel, and you would have the old story of the American colonies over again. "Ah! yes," you say, "but our governors are wiser now." Are they? Take the present Ministry. Has it shown any remarkable wisdom since it took office? Is it not the laughing-stock of the world? Has it not shown itself incompetent alike in diplomacy and in war? It is undoubtedly the worst Government we have had for many years, and it will not be left to future ages to recognise that fact.

But no Government, however able, could solve the problem. If the colonies are represented in the Imperial Parliament and have a voice in the raising of taxation, then they ought to be taxed; but we know that they will not submit to be taxed for Imperial purposes. Let the British Government try to impose a war-tax on Australia, and see what would be the result. If the Government persisted, it would end in separation. But then, you say, "If they had approved of the war through their representatives in the Imperial Parliament they ought to pay the necessary tax." But would they? What an outcry is being raised in this country by practically all sections of the community against the heavy taxation for a war policy which the majority of the voters approved, and in which they erroneously believed their interests to be involved!

What real or fancied interest have the Australians in South Africa that they should be willing cheerfully to pay the war tax? It is true that a few Australians went to the South African War as volunteers; but if you infer from that that the Australians, as a whole, are willing to pay 1s. 2d. in the pound for direct Imperial taxation, or that they would submit to be peeled and plundered by the various modes of indirect taxation for the sake of the British Empire, you do not know the Australians.

Imperial Federation, in the true sense of the term, is a baseless dream, which, if it were by any chance realised, would be disastrous to the progress of the human race.

The alternative, then, is separation, for Mr. Froude himself acknowledges that the present system, if continued, would keep the colonies children for ever. There is a time in every man's life when he sees the necessity of looking after himself, when he passes from the care and oversight of his parents into a larger and fuller life. Separation takes place voluntarily. Ought the father to feel himself insulted when his son sets up house for himself? Ought the mother-country to feel herself insulted if South Africa, Australia

and Canada set up for themselves? We believe that the progress of the nation is best furthered by the independence of the individual adult. Why do we not believe the analogous truth that the progress of the world is best furthered by the independence of the individual nation?

Can any man believe that the great American Republic would have done its great work for the world if it had remained a mere colony, or if, while represented in the Imperial Parliament, it had been taxed to the bone for British wars? No. The progress of the race will not be furthered in the long run by the self-governing colonial plan, nor by the Imperial Federation scheme.

The time will come, if our colonies are to be great nations, when they must burst their bonds and stand before the world as men ready to run in the great race of progress.

Mr. Froude compares the relation of the colony and the mother-country to that of a husband and wife. This comparison is not worthy of so great a man. The relation which Scotland and England bear to each other may be said to correspond with the relation which a husband bears to his wife, for Scotland and England entered voluntarily into this union. He says, "Divorce between husband and wife is always a possibility, for divorce is a consequence of sin, and men and women are all liable to sin; but a married pair do not contemplate divorce, or speak of it, or make preparation for it, either when they begin their lives together, or tread through their daily round of duties and enjoyments side by side." That is true. Separation between Scotland and England is always a possibility, for one nation might sin against the other in such a way that a divorce would have to be agreed upon. But, as Mr. Froude says, "Talked of and debated, it is already on its way to realisation, and a family would be fit for an asylum of idiots where the rending of natural ties was a permitted subject of thought or conversation. Let separation be dismissed into silence as a horrible thing, not to be named among us, and the union is already made." That applies to England and Scotland, but not to Britain and the colonies. Britain is the parent of the colonies; they are her children, and should be made to understand that the time will come when they must set up house for themselves.

Under the present system, as Froude himself says, heroes cannot arise in the colonies. They would have no scope for their energies. The colonists, with the exception of the South Africans, are living in an enchanted garden. In South Africa itself, where do we find the great men, the heroes? Is it not in the Transvaal and the Orange Free State? It is true that some of them were born in Cape Colony, but they did not find themselves till they arrived in the independent States. Can Cape Colony, Natal, Australia, New Zealand, or Canada produce names fit to stand beside those of

Kruger, Steyn, De Wet, Joubert, Delarey, and Botha, whose glorious deeds have made the world wonder?

But, you say, "We can't afford to let the colonies go. Britain would not be a great nation then"; and Mr. Froude says, "A great nation makes great men; a small nation makes little men." That is, perhaps, Mr. Froude's worst fallacy. Why, the greatest men the world has ever known have been born and brought up in small States. Think of the great Hebrews whose lives are recorded in the Old Testament; were they citizens of a great State?

Think of the noble Athenian writers and warriors; were they citizens of a great State? How poor and mean, to the discerning eye, is the great Persian Empire when contrasted with the small Athenian Republic!

Think of the period when Italy was divided into small States; can you honestly say that it was wanting in great men? Why, no country in the world at that time surpassed Italy in great men. How few now are the great men of Italy, when Italy is unified?

Who are the two great writers who have influenced most the dramatic literature of our day? Ibsen and Björnson, Norwegians, natives of a small State.

And what of our own Britain? England was a very small nation when the world's greatest writer, Shakespeare, appeared on the scene with his illustrious companions.

The great German writers arose when the old German Empire was in its decrepitude, but now that Germany is a great empire once again, where are her illustrious writers?

France was a great nation in the days of Louis XIV., and great writers arose. This seems to favour Mr. Froude's view, but it is counterbalanced by the fact that France was a much greater nation in the reign of Napoleon I. and yet produced no great literature. It was not till France had been humiliated in the dust that great literature came to be written.

This is hardly the place to enter into a discussion on the influence of militarism on literature, but we may take an instance from our own day. Rudyard Kipling is the chief poet of militarism at the present time. When he deals with the absent-minded beggar and his ways Mr. Kipling is disgusting, but when he leaves the barrack-room and the drill-ground and enters the crowded streets and fantastic dwellings of the people of India, or peers into the jungle and sees the strange life of the beasts in that wilderness of God, we feel that he is one of the few writers whom the world calls great.

He is great, not because of his Imperialism, but in spite of it; his repulsive doggerel will die, but his Indian tales will charm the world for ever.

Do not misunderstand me. The struggles of a gallant people for national independence have always produced noble literature, and always will, to the end of time. The greatest poets have not been slow to take their stand for righteousness and truth, and in this way war has stimulated poetic genius. If it had not been for the detestable South African war, we should not have known how high William Watson could soar, nor to what depths Mr. Swinburne could fall. Compare the two and judge the case. Read the noble sonnets of Mr. Watson and the ferocious sonnet of Mr. Swinburne, in which he who once hailed with the most abounding joy the establishment of republics, hounded on Britain's war-dogs to the destruction of the Orange Free State and the South African Republic. "Oh! what a fall was there, my countrymen!"

Mr. Froude's contention, then, is untrue, that a great nation makes great men, a small nation makes little men. Is there, then, no sense in which it is true? There is, if you do not measure greatness by extent of territory. It is true that a great or high-souled nation, however small, will produce great men who will influence the world for good; and as we have seen from the history of the world, it is the rule that from these small States great men come. It is the exception when they spring from large States. One, however, who holds a brief for large States may be inclined to say that those great men who are born in large States are of a higher rank than those who are born in small States. This is my answer: It is universally acknowledged that Shakespeare, Milton, and Dante are the three greatest modern poets. Dante was born in the small State of Florence; Shakespeare and Milton in the larger but still small State of England. What, then, is the reason of this superiority of small States over large States? It is the old story of David and Goliath over again. When a State is large and populous the members of that State are, as a rule, careless of public matters, and interested almost wholly in the accumulation of wealth or in working for their daily bread; and while they may have, no doubt, a great deal of excitable patriotism, and disdain for every country but their own, yet they lack that absorbing and continuous interest in national affairs which smaller nations almost always have. You may say, "The British people do not lack an absorbing interest in national affairs." I say that they do. How many years is it now since any great political reform was achieved? People ignorantly talk as if the British Constitution were the most perfect in the world; but this is not the case. There is very much to do in political reform before we are on a level with the United States, France, and Switzerland; and if the British people took an intelligent interest in their own national affairs they would see this. Instead of that, they interfere in the affairs of other nations, and instead of putting things right at home they try, as they say, to put things right abroad. By

the bye, how would the British nation relish interference with its internal or external policy?

So much attention has been bestowed on foreign affairs that our own affairs have been almost entirely neglected. I do not deprecate the study of foreign politics. Far from that. Britain may gain many useful hints from the despised foreigner; but it is not, as a rule, their home politics which we study. It is their foreign politics. We do not study to learn from them. No! We study their affairs to interfere with them, and if we can, slice off bits of territory, or even to destroy their independence. We are the Pharisees of the world; with great professions and small performance, we, like the father of the Pharisees, travel the earth seeking whom we may devour.

"Ah! but," you say, "look at the good we do." That is not the point. What right have you to interfere? Good often comes from evil acts. If I kill a wicked man, I may salve my conscience by saying that it was a good thing that he should be out of the world; but the law will say, "What business was it of yours to decide that?" "Yes," you may say, "but in the case of a wicked nation what would you do?" I ask, "Is there any nation in the world which can truthfully be called a wicked nation?" "Oh!" you say, "look at the impure French." "Very well," I say, "look at the drunken British." Every nation has its vices. You will, however, find that those vices are much less extensively diffused than people seem to think. Any one who knows the French people will tell you that it is a shameful libel on the French nation to call it impure. It is also a great mistake to talk of the British as a drunken nation. Is the character of a nation to be judged by its riff-raff? I do not deny that every nation has a national character, but there is no nation in the world whose character is such as ought to deprive it of its independence. Of course I am not speaking of those States which are without the pale of civilisation. The late Soudanese State ruled by the Khalifa was one of these. The Ashantee kingdom, ruled over by Prempeh, was another. Dahomey, ruled over by Behanzin, was another. These States could truthfully be called wicked States, States which ought not to exist, and which have rightly been erased from the list of nations.

Some friends of the Boers show their unwisdom by putting the Orange Free State and the South African Republic on a level with Ashantee, Soudan, and Dahomey, and saying that in all these cases armed intervention and the destruction of the national existence of these States was wrong. I fail to see the reasonableness of this position. The Boers themselves would scorn to see themselves put on a level with murderous blacks, and they are right. Let the philanthropists talk as they like of the equality of man, there is a whole world of difference between a savage and a civilised man.

The statesman would make a great mistake who should deal with a savage as he would with a civilised man, and he would make as great a mistake if he should deal with a civilised man as he would deal with a savage.

I am not putting in a plea for high-handed aggression on the rights of native races, but I believe that much harm has been done to the cause of freedom by the neglect of this essential distinction.

When, then, I may be asked, is a civilised nation justified in destroying the independence of another State? I answer when that State is held by the general voice of the civilised world to be a barbarous, uncivilised State, one whose continued existence would be a blot upon the face of God's earth. The Soudanese Empire was such a State. The civilised world were agreed that the destruction of the power of the Khalifa was justifiable.

It is true that there is a strong feeling in France against Britain on account of her prolonged occupation of Egypt in the face of so many promises to leave when her work is done. Shrewd statesmen at home and abroad have long been of the opinion that Britain's work there will never be done, and not without reason. When the British Lion puts its paw on a country it will not let go its grasp unless by force. It is very wrong, of course, but such is the nature of the royal animal. This feeling does exist on the continent, and especially in France, but no one has dared to contest the indisputable fact that it was a glorious day for the world when the Dervish Empire disappeared into oblivion.

If France had been in charge of Egypt, I have no doubt that she herself would have done the good work, and have earned the admiration of the world. For various reasons I myself would have preferred to have seen France do it alone, or, at least, in conjunction with Britain, but as regards the deed itself there can be no reasonable doubt of its justice.

I am aware that in acknowledging the justice of the conquest of the Soudan, some Imperialists may say that I have practically given up the case against the annexation of the two Boer States. To this I reply that I have not done so.

When my opponents can prove that the Boer States are without the pale of civilisation, that they are barbarous, uncivilised States whose existence would be a blot upon the face of God's earth, I shall support the annexation of the two States, but not till then.

Civilised Europe was convinced of the justice of the conquest of the Soudan. How does it view the South African war?

Surely no one who has studied continental opinion can doubt that Britain is regarded as being decidedly in the wrong in this quarrel. Britain stands alone in this matter. Britain alone is convinced that her cause is just, and even Britain is not united. There is a minority which is daily growing larger. The case stands thus—One

Nation, *v.* the Civilised World. Is it probable that Britain is in the right? The accused party maintains that she is in the right. Ought the judge and jury to accept the word of the prisoner at the bar? Even if the Boer States were in the wrong, it would still be unjust to destroy their independence. France was in the wrong when she fought with Prussia in 1870. Do you think that the civilised world would have approved the annexation of France by Prussia? Not at all. It would have been iniquitous. Is it not possible, my annexationist friend, that some day Britain might undertake an unjust war? If Britain were defeated in that war, according to your reasoning, the victorious nation would be justified in annexing Britain. "But Britain would never engage in an unjust war," you say. No, my patriotic friend, I believe that you are right. No war in which Britain engaged could possibly be an unjust war. O most righteous nation, whose sword is never drawn save in a just cause! Other nations may err, and have erred, but Britain alone is always in the right. My friend, we have got rid, with much trouble, of an infallible Pope. Is our case much improved when for him you substitute an infallible nation?

Let us, however, ascertain if the two Boer States are savage, uncivilised States, whose continued existence would be a blot upon God's earth. The Orange Free State has been universally praised alike by Imperialists and anti-Imperialists as being a model State. You will not find the same agreement regarding the State called Great Britain. It is this model State which Great Britain is attempting to destroy.

"But its citizens invaded British territory." That is the sole charge against them.

In this I believe that they were justified. When the British had destroyed the independence of the Transvaal, it would not have been long till the Orange Free State would have been in the hands of the British. At the best, its independence would have been merely nominal, and sooner or later a pretext would have been found for its incorporation into the empire.

Like a wise statesman, President Steyn saw this, and formed his league with the South African Republic, to which, in honour and expediency, he was bound to adhere.

But let us suppose that the invasion was a crime, does any sane man think that if the British invaded Germany, and were defeated by the Germans, that the German Emperor would be justified in invading Britain, annexing it to the German Empire, and styling those loyal Britons who should remain true to the independence of their country, rebels? Certainly not. Such a proceeding would be most unjust. Yet this is exactly what Britain is doing in South Africa. But when I apply this argument to the annexation of the Orange Free State I am told that is a different matter.

No doubt it is a different matter. That is, it is not the same matter, but it is a similar matter.

The same reasoning applies to both cases. It will not do to say that Britain is the paramount Power in South Africa, for the Orange Free State is in international law absolutely independent, as independent as France, Britain, or Germany.

Britain is therefore not justified in annexing the Orange Free State. She is violating the golden rule alike in the letter and the spirit, and for this she will be (nay, is being) judged by the Ruler of the world.

The South African Republic next claims our attention. The most unscrupulous attacks have been made against the Government of this Republic, because of its restrictive measures. Now, I am no friend to restrictions, but there are times in the history of every State when restrictions are necessary and useful, and in the peculiar circumstances of the Transvaal, I believe that President Kruger and his Government were justified in being very wary upon whom they conferred the franchise. The independence of the Republic was at stake, and the attempt was being made to gain by votes what the British had failed to win by arms.

In similar circumstances our Government would lay itself open to the charge of narrowness and illiberality.

"But President Kruger interfered with the liberty of the press. You cannot deny that."

Can I not? He interfered with the licence of the press.

In the *Uitlander Press* the destruction of the Republic was advocated, and President Kruger was subjected to the most shameless abuse.

A supporter of the British Government should be the last to bring this charge against the Transvaal Government. Is not the liberty of the press being daily infringed in South Africa? Are not newspapers and periodicals opposed to the hateful policy of the Imperial Government refused admission into South Africa? Are not editors of South African newspapers being imprisoned and fined? Freedom of the press is a thing unknown in South Africa. All this is the work of the nation which boasts of its liberty, and speaks of the glorious freedom to be found under its flag.

"Ah, but the freedom of the press ought not to exist in exceptional circumstances."

Out of your own mouth you have vindicated President Kruger. He was justified in the measures he took against the defamers of his nation and character.

That charge is then disposed of.

"Ah! But he taxed the *Uitlanders*, and taxation without representation is tyranny."

What a tyrannous nation Britain must be! A large number of adults, male and female, in this country have no votes, and yet they

are taxed directly or indirectly. Here is taxation without representation.

Have the vast populations of India votes? No; and yet they are ground to the dust by the taxation of the British Indian Government. Here again is taxation without representation.

It is then most inconsistent for a Briton to cry out against President Kruger on this account. For my part, I do not hold the view that every individual, at all times and in all circumstances, is entitled to have a vote.

Is there any reasonable politician who does?

These arguments of Britain's advocates would justify the annexation of Britain by another Power who should profess itself willing to give votes to all.

"But we are going to give equal rights to all, white and black alike."

Are you? If you mean by that that you are going to give a vote to every black, savage or civilised, South Africa will not be long in British hands. What is the use of talking of equal rights when the majority of the blacks are not fit for the suffrage, and when the British Government has no intention of conferring it on the blacks as a whole? This talk of equal rights for white and black alike, where it is not foolish is dishonest. No responsible statesman contemplates such a thing.

Why destroy the independence of the Transvaal to give votes to a few blacks?

"But the Transvaal was not independent before the war."

The Transvaal was not at the outbreak of the war absolutely independent. Some argue as if that settled the matter, as if we had a right to annex the Republic when we thought fit. Not so. Why was the Transvaal in this degrading position?

Because Britain had, in her high-handed way, taken advantage of the troubles of the Republic to annex the Transvaal, and after the successful war of independence and the two conventions, it did not hold the same position as it held before the annexation of 1877. Before 1877 it was absolutely independent. This position is often called suzerainty by the mob and their slaves, the fawning politicians; but an international lawyer would not call it by that name.

It was thus in a different position from the Orange Free State, i.e., it was not, like its sister Republic, an international sovereign State. It had, nevertheless, the status of an independent State, and was termed such not only by British Ministers and law officers, but also by books of reference such as *Hazell's Annual*.

Great Britain had no legal right to interfere with the affairs of the Transvaal unless its Government had violated the provisions of the second convention. Now, the action of the Transvaal with regard to the Uitlander franchise question was not a violation of the terms of the convention. We find in it a promise that the British

Uitlanders shall enjoy their civil rights. What are civil rights? The right of marriage, the right of trade, and the right to police protection, but not the right of voting. The right of voting is a political right, and in interfering with the franchise of the State the British Government broke the convention. The right of admitting aliens into its body corporate rests with the State in which these aliens reside, and no other State has any right to interfere.

In similar circumstances we should strongly resent the action of Italy or Russia in interfering with the undoubted right of our Government to refuse to grant letters of naturalisation to Italians or Poles, if such refusal were deemed necessary in the interests of the State.

It must also be remembered that the British Government can refuse letters of naturalisation to a foreigner without giving any reason whatever. The South African Republic had therefore not violated the terms of the convention with regard to the franchise.

Again, in the first convention Great Britain was recognised as suzerain over the Transvaal, but in the second convention there was no mention of that odious word. I say odious, because no white nation which respects itself and its traditions will long continue to acknowledge suzerainty to another, and the South African Republic rightly regarded itself as independent after the second convention, and prominent leaders in Parliament at the time said that the suzerainty had been abolished.

Mr. Chamberlain, however, in his wisdom saw fit to revive this obsolete claim, and thereby excited the just anger of all lovers of national freedom alike in Europe and in Africa.

Here arises an interesting question. It seems to be generally taken for granted, even by some of the advocates of the Boer cause, that if the rulers of an independent State acknowledge, whether voluntarily or by force, the suzerainty of another State, or the subordination of that State to another State, that they as well as the nation are bound in honour and in reason to cease from endeavouring to restore their nation to its former independence.

I cannot take this view. Apply it to our own nation. If Great Britain were invaded by the German Emperor, and if King Edward and Lord Salisbury were to acknowledge the German Emperor as their suzerain, the German Emperor having agreed on his part to leave Great Britain free to manage her own internal affairs, does any friend of freedom, nay, does any patriotic Briton believe that this nation would be justified in remaining in that subordinate position to Germany one moment longer than we could possibly help it? Many so-called patriots of the unreasonable sort would say without hesitation that we would be perfectly justified in endeavouring to regain our lost independence, but if Great Britain herself were the suzerain of Germany, then they would say that Germany was morally bound to abide in her subordinate status.

Any thinking man can see that that is a most illogical position, and yet that is practically how many so-called patriots reason regarding the South African Republic. The revolutionary Parisians worshipped the Goddess of Reason. The patriotic British Jingoës worship the Goddess of Unreason. For my part, I prefer the Goddess of Reason. When we see men who glory in the deeds of Wallace and Bruce, those great guerilla leaders, foam at the mouth when De Wet and Botha, men of the same noble strain, receive their due meed of praise, we see how pseudo-patriotism prevents its devotees from recognising the truth.

I do not agree with Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman when he says that the working classes as a whole were not in favour of the war. So far as my experience goes, it is quite the reverse. The working-classes in Scotland at any rate fiercely supported the war at its beginning, and rejoiced madly over British victories. Some people who call themselves Radicals talk as if that fact settled the question of the justice of the war, but to me it does no such thing. Nay, rather, I would be inclined to say that it settled the question of the injustice of the war, for I do not consider that ignorant working men, choke-full of national prejudice, who work hard through the day, and swallow all the lies of their favourite newspaper in the evening, are fit judges of a nation's true policy. There is no doubt a considerable minority opposed to the war, but that it is a minority I am certain. Our Imperialist friends say that since the majority of the people are in favour of the war, the minority ought to bow to their decision. I deny that doctrine of the devil. If I believe that my countrymen, misled by prejudice and passion, are bent on committing a great crime, I am perfectly justified in refusing my assent to the deed, and in endeavouring to win men to see the truth of the case as I see it.

It is a travesty of Liberal doctrine to say that the people are always right.

I approve of manhood suffrage, not because I believe that the working men are wise, far-seeing politicians, but simply as a means of political education. Sometimes they will be right; at other times they will be wrong. When they are wrong I shall expose their errors; when they are right I shall gladly confess it.

The attempt is being made on the Unionist side to set the average working man upon a pedestal as our political pope, and reasonable men are asked to bow down and worship him. For my part, I cannot worship such a variable individual. At one election he is against Home Rule; at the next he is for it, and at the next he is against it again.

It is too much the custom for Liberals to talk as if the lower classes were necessarily the friends of political freedom.

Who overthrew the Roman Republic? The lower classes. Who

rejoiced in the overthrow of the British Republic? The lower classes. Who are the fiercest upholders of Britain's supposed right to annex the two South African Republics? The lower classes.

In our own day we are in the midst of a great reaction against Liberal ideas. This sentiment, no doubt, exists more or less in all classes, but it is very strong and very fierce amongst the lower classes. Republicanism as a political creed is almost dead; not for many generations has Royalism been so popular amongst the lower classes. In the writings of the most eminent Republicans this feeling of distrust of the lower classes is evident. The writers recognised that they were addressing their equals, that they were addressing educated men who could appreciate argument.

The ancient Greek and Roman republican writers, with Milton and Sidney, realised that the ignorant and untutored mob is no true friend of liberty. They knew how dearly the people love a master, a lord, a king, or an emperor, and read with horror that often in the past republics had fallen because the people wished to have a king. The fate of the republic of Israel is a typical case.

Is it not possible, then, to bring the wandering sheep back to the fold of Liberalism?

I believe that it is possible. "Educate, educate," must be our watchword. For my part, I believe that the library is the best university, and the spread of free libraries throughout the land I recognise to be the brightest sign of our times. With the diffusion of knowledge Imperialism will die, and the working classes will stand forth as the ablest advocates and upholders of political and social freedom.

Then this South African War will be regarded as a colossal crime, and Mr. Froude will be honoured as a brave and noble man who risked much for the sake of his country's honour. Mr. Froude's Imperialism will be regarded as the delusion of a noble nature, and Britain will no longer seek to hinder the free development of the great States beyond the sea, but will leave them free to work out their own salvation.

I do not deny that great dangers will arise in the future to the United States of Canada, to the United States of South Africa, and to the United States of Australia; it is therefore meet that they walk warily, with fear and trembling. Republics, as well as monarchies, have to fight the demons of Imperialism, militarism, and socialism, and therefore I say, "with fear and trembling." "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," is a most wise saying.

The emancipated colonies, great children of a glorious mother, will go forward with high hope and strenuous endeavour, knowing that base men are longing for their fall, but also that all lovers of free and wise institutions are their friends, and believe that they are co-workers in the enlightening and freeing of the world.

PETER STRUTHERS.

THE POLITICAL SIR WILLOUGHBY PATTERNE.

A CANDID LIBERAL VIEW OF MR. CHAMBERLAIN.

"THE Egoist," says Mr. George Meredith, "surely inspires pity." Sir Willoughby Patterne, analysed by the greatest living master of English fiction, certainly inspires an emotion of that character. The Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, Colonial Secretary, is a supreme Egoist—the Sir Willoughby Patterne of modern political life. He does not, however, inspire pity in Liberal breasts so much as antipathy, mixed with reluctant admiration. If the real Sir Willoughby "had a leg," Mr. Chamberlain has a temper. He has also a tongue, a past—possibly a future. With regard to the latter, much will depend upon the health of Lord Salisbury, the ambition of Mr. Balfour, and the general temper of the Conservative party when the next Conservative Premiership is open to competition. As this sketch is not intended to supply a forecast of Mr. Chamberlain's future, interesting as that may be, the fascinating problem just hinted at must be left to settle itself, a thing fascinating problems do not always do. Time at least will settle that one. The mere fact, however, that Mr. Chamberlain must be reckoned among the possible Prime Ministers of the future is a significant comment upon his career and personality.

A STUDY IN INCONSISTENCY.

It is Mr. Chamberlain's past that most loudly bespeaks the Egoist. It may, of course, be said of a politician, as of other men, that not to change one's mind is proof of no mind to change. The fiercest opponent of Mr. Chamberlain would be loath to deny that the Colonial Secretary has a mind, seeing that he has changed the same on so many questions. His career is a study in inconsistency. To make a charge like that, however, is not necessarily to imply condemnation of a statesman. There is a worthy inconsistency, as there is an unworthy consistency. Mr. Gladstone, whose name is still a precious legacy both to the Liberal party and the nation as a whole, began his matchless and illustrious career as "the rising hope

of those stern and unbending Tories." Yet nobody thinks of recalling the great Liberal chieftain as a turncoat. His political life was a progressive evolution. He emerged from Toryism into Whiggery, and from that into the broad and generous Liberalism to which his own name was given as an appropriate descriptive adjective—Gladstonian.

It is a reproach to Mr. Chamberlain that no such natural growth of political mind can be said to have marked or justified his change of sides. He did not evolve, but simply somersaulted. Joseph turned his coat of many-coloured Radicalism. The secret of the aversion felt by Liberals towards Mr. Chamberlain is not due merely to the fact that he is now one of their most able and bitter opponents, but because he betrayed the party and Mr. Gladstone for his own vaulting ambition. The Egoist had grown to realise that while the "G. O. M." reigned supreme at the head of the Liberal party, there was no chance for him to crown his career as a Liberal Premier. Home Rule was a convenient opportunity for a fresh move on the political chess-board. He made the move and surrendered the cherished convictions of a lifetime. Mr. Chamberlain knew that he would have a large enough following behind him, composed of the family circle of Birmingham Liberals and conscientious objectors to Home Rule throughout the country, to make his presence on the Tory side of the House of Commons worth paying for in position and influence. His judgment was accurate. Although he declared that "I confess I shrink from these new allies," he soon found himself at home among the Tory legions, and in time came to say that the gulf between himself and his old friends was too great "to be bridged over." Adding to the suspicious nature of his conversion must be reckoned Mr. Chamberlain's apparent absence of pain at the change of his relations to Mr. Gladstone, a statesman to whom he had previously paid some of the finest personal tributes one politician had ever paid to another. He stood up to his old chief with all the bitter and strenuous antagonism of a young Cecil. He did not seem willing to wound and yet afraid to strike. He struck! There are episodes Liberals who remember the Home Rule fight between Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Gladstone can never forget. The "G. O. M." was strenuous and magnanimous. Mr. Chamberlain was strenuous and—vindictive. In political warfare much can be forgiven. But one thing can neither be forgiven nor forgotten—viz. Mr. Chamberlain's ungracious treatment of his old leader.

"WALWORTH SENTIMENTS."

It is generally accounted somewhat beside the mark to hark back to the old speeches of a politician. Usually, it is a cheap device for winning partisan cheers at the expense of the temporary discomfiture

of an opponent. In Mr. Chamberlain's case, however, such a course is necessary and justifiable if the significance of his present position is to be fully realised. If ever Radicalism seemed bred in the bone it was in the case of the subject of this study. He lived until he was fifty the pungent apostle of advanced democracy. His "Walworth sentiments" are very easily gleaned from the speeches he made at Sheffield in 1874, during his first Parliamentary contest, the only contest, by the way, he ever lost. As it happens that the present writer might at this moment have been represented by Mr. Chamberlain if he had succeeded in capturing Sheffield, he may be more than excused in turning back for a moment to the record of that early campaign. "I am glad," said Mr. Chamberlain in his very first speech,

"to be an advanced Liberal, if that means that I intend to use every opportunity I can gain or the influence I may possess to advance my Liberalism, and not, as some politicians do, use my Liberalism to advance myself. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) I feel that there are too many men of that stamp already in the House of Commons, and I would not lift my little finger to go in as one of that company. They talk the cant of Liberalism; they have the watchwords of the great Liberal party for ever on their lips; but when they are called upon to practise the professions which they make, they have always some excuse ready to their hands."

This was the prelude to the programme laid before the electors of Sheffield by the Radical Mayor of Birmingham and Chairman of the School Board on that occasion. Free land, a free Church, ending or mending of the House of Lords, housing reform, &c., all were in the modest programme of that January 1, 1874. According to a recent pronouncement of the Duke of Devonshire, the term "Liberal" Unionist is still to be retained by the Chamberlain wing of the Conservative party. *But when they are called upon to practise the professions which they make, they have always some excuse ready to their hands.* That is the scornful comment of the Chamberlain of 1874 upon himself and his friends, who, to-day, support a Government which gives doles to landlords, rates to parsons, and broken pledges to the democracy. And the "ready excuse" is Home Rule, a question which Mr. Chamberlain declared long ago to be as dead as Queen Anne. "A thoroughgoing Tory I can understand and even appreciate." So can all we Liberals. What we can neither understand nor appreciate is a politician who ends his career with a practical repudiation of the political ethics with which he started it, while still talking "the cant of Liberalism." I say we cannot understand this spectacle; that statement must be qualified. By interpreting Mr. Chamberlain as the Sir Willoughby Patterne of the political hour, we can understand it. If Mr. Chamberlain's brain could be pierced a picture of himself might stand revealed.

THE EGOIST AS PATRIOT.

Let it not be imagined that we deny the Egoist the title of Patriot. The original Sir Willoughby was the "English gentleman wherever he went," and at home an urban politician with a high sense of public duty. Mr. Chamberlain has devoted his amazing cleverness and much energy and time to the State. It is possible to do all this, and still to be masterful, ambitious, vindictive, and dangerous. Though the present writer agrees with the drift if not with the temper of the Colonial Secretary's policy in the South African war, he believes that Mr. Chamberlain has not the tactful manner nor the genial disposition of the successful diplomatist. It is as easy to create an angry scene on the Continent as in the House of Commons. A waspish speech, made with a tongue that can cut like a rapier, will create either equally well. Verbal victories may gain cheers, but they invariably provoke enemies. Seeing that the Colonial Secretary can be nasty with his own friends, it is not surprising that he should not have a nice way with those who differ from him outright. He becomes more exasperating because, though he often loses his temper, he always keeps his head. "How is Mrs. Kruger?" It was the Egoist desiring to say something that would bring him under the limelight, that offered the "long spoon" to Russia, and an imaginary treaty to Germany. While Lord Salisbury is slow and safe as a Foreign Minister, Mr. Chamberlain is brilliant and indiscreet. Lord Salisbury, equally with his colleague at the Colonial Office, "has a tongue." The one can bridle the "unruly member," the other cannot. There is no need to say which is which.

"ANTI-CHAMBERLAINISM."

So far as the Liberals who hate the present war are concerned, it is not extravagant to suggest that their so-called pro-Boerism is more anti-Chamberlainism than anything else. To them (rightly or wrongly it is not for the writer to surmise), the personality of the Colonial Secretary has been one of the most unfortunate factors in the game. Arrogant and overbearing himself, they look upon him as representing a national policy of arrogance and high-handedness. At least, a Minister who was readier to keep the diplomatic door on the swing by the application of the "oiled feather" would, in their opinion, have saved the situation and therefore the lives of thousands of men and much treasure in cash. It is not Mr. Chamberlain's habit to carry the "oiled feather," nor, in unwilling admiration must it be confessed, to show the "white feather" either. No one, however hostile, can truly say that he shirks a challenge. If anything, he is too ready to fight without one. He is a born controversialist, loving battle for its own sake. That is a characteristic of people who can wield sharp weapons with dexterous skill. If carried to

excess it brings more ephemeral glory than permanent advantage. Mr. Chamberlain has the fault, and as a result, he is more feared than respected, and more respected than loved. It is easy for a Liberal to detect the absence of personal enthusiasm for Mr. Chamberlain among the Conservative ranks. The convert is always a suspect. At the same time, the party recognises a deep debt owing to him, and is ready to cheer him when he is at close quarters with the enemy. Mr. Balfour seems more amicably disposed towards him than any one else. Perhaps that is because Mr. Chamberlain gives and takes knocks with the Opposition that should really have fallen to his own lot. If Mr. Balfour's indolence likes a deputy leader in debate, Mr. Chamberlain's vanity cherishes the delight of being that deputy. The Egoist again!

THE FATAL DEFECT.

In spite of his brilliant oratorical gifts, Mr. Chamberlain has never been regarded as an orator in the full sense of the word. Lucid, clear, incisive, ironic, sarcastic, and polished is his speech; but it glitters rather than glows, and is effective rather than inspiring. It lacks the sublime moral fervour and lofty passion for humanity that made the oratory of Mr. Gladstone a flaming torch, whereby great enthusiasms caught fire and blazed throughout the land. Mr. Chamberlain's creed, at its best, is more of head than of heart. He is more a Kitchener than a Roberts of politics—bloodless and cold, not inhuman, of course, but by no means a sentimentalist. He may be the dictator of Birmingham; he will never be the idol of the men in the street. Mr. Chamberlain lacks imagination, and can never become a great statesman whose lot it is to read his history in a nation's eyes. He may be classed, however, as a very clever politician who has deciphered many notable electoral triumphs in the ballot-box. His private life has always appeared as beyond reproach, adorned by all the respectable family virtues. It will always be said that Mr. Chamberlain, while bitter to his political opponents, was mindful of his friends. In that he competes with his chief, Lord Salisbury. If the latter built a ministerial refuge, "The Hotel Cecil," Mr. Chamberlain created a "Birmingham gang," and earned the gratitude of respectable mediocrity as represented by Mr. Jesse Collings and Mr. Powell Williams. In selecting such modest henchmen Mr. Chamberlain displayed customary astuteness. He repaid personal loyalty without surrounding himself by possible rivals. That, too, is the way of the Egoist!

Even if Mr. Chamberlain gets no further than the Colonial Secretaryship, his career will represent a considerable success for a political Sir Willoughby Patterne, who lies under the suspicion of having given up conviction for convenience when the "ready excuse" of Home Rule presented itself.

J. B. HOBMAN.

CO-OPERATORS AND THE NEW CENTURY.

A GREAT WORK TO BE DONE.

"For the cause that lacks assistance,
'Gainst the wrong that needs resistance,
For the future in the distance,
And the good that we can do."

To the mere party politician the thirty-third Annual Co-operative Congress, held at Middlesbrough in May last, is at once a portent and a warning. To the humanitarian whose sole interest in politics lies in the fact that politics may be made a powerful lever for the uplifting and the ennobling of mankind, the proceedings of this the first British Co-operative Congress of the Twentieth Century are, on the other hand, full of hope and inspiration.

During the past half-century co-operation has done a great and good work in connection with the industrial, commercial, and social life of the nation; but its political life, so far as direct action is concerned, has hitherto been almost entirely neglected. At the recent Congress, however, it was made very evident that co-operators are beginning to realise that the co-operative movement, in common with the whole industrial, commercial, and social life of the nation, is "cribbed, cabined and confined" by barriers that political action alone can remove; and signs were not wanting that the co-operators, trained for more than half a century in the art of self-government on truly democratic lines, are becoming disgusted with the misgovernment of the "ruling classes" of this country, and are by no means indisposed to take the matter in hand and insist upon the thorough democratisation of British institutions.

Co-operators of the old school, of course, stand aghast when they see the good ship about to embark upon the stormy waters of politics, but it is manifest that the old watchword, "No politics," has now lost its power, and that, come what may, the co-operators of to-day take a broader view of life, and have a bolder grasp of its realities and responsibilities than the co-operators of yesterday.

In this there is no departure from co-operative ideals and co-operative principles, but as the cause progresses the ideals become clearer, and it is seen that the great principles upon which

co-operation is based apply to every department of life. As the Bishop of Durham (Dr. Westcott, D.D.) said at the Congress luncheon :

"The movement did not represent to him merely a wise arrangement for buying and selling, or an association of any particular class ; but it embodied the true relation of men to men. That conviction led him, more than thirty years ago, to enter with thorough spirit into the co-operative movement, and that conviction had sustained his faith in the movement ever since. It was his duty to endeavour to bring his faith into the common relationships of life, and he saw in the co-operative movement a serious and a successful, though an imperfect, embodiment of what was a great principle, namely, that we were all members one of another. That was his idea of the co-operative movement, and it was brought home to him by the original rules of the Rochdale Pioneers."

Again, at the opening of the Co-operative Exhibition, his Lordship spoke in a similar strain :

"The permanent success of their endeavours was to be measured not by the accumulation of money, but by the ennobling of character. The primary question which each had to face and to answer was not what personal gain had he secured, but how was his effort made effective for all in the highest possible way. . . . There was room for many experiments, but the central thought was clear and commanding—the elevation of the worker through his work, the elevation of man, as man, for one object. The cause advanced and the ideal grew clearer, and for his own part he believed in the ideal. Nothing which did not rest upon the ideal, the eternal truth, could succeed ; nothing which did could fail."

The broader outlook upon life and the bolder grasp of its realities and responsibilities were strongly evidenced in the able presidential address delivered by Mr. J. Warwick. Briefly reviewing the history of the co-operative movement, Mr. Warwick said :

"It fell to the lot of the nineteenth century to evolve from its social life in Toad Lane, Rochdale, something that had in it all the elements essential to inspire a hope that the day had dawned upon the people when their social salvation had come. . . .

"In the year 1844 . . . twenty-eight men combined together. Their capital, which they pooled, was £28 ; their trade for the first year, £710. At the close of the year 1900 there were in the United Kingdom 1464 distributive societies, having a membership of 1,709,371, with share capital amounting to the fabulous sum of £20,586,231, doing a trade of £50,053,567, and handing back to the membership no less a sum than £7,747,338, showing a net saving on the spending power of the consumer of 15 per cent."

Then, looking to the future with faith and hope grounded on the experience of the past, he continued :

"One of the chief aspirations of the human race is for freedom, nor can we forget that the principal motive that prompted the Rochdale Pioneers to adopt their new system was to find through it a way to emancipation—emancipation from the commercial exploitation of the age, emancipation from the industrial serfdom that ground down the workers, emancipation from the tyranny that arose from the trading conditions under which they lived."

furnish a practical demonstration. Mr. Warwick justly claimed that the co-operative movement—including mutual building societies—has had a large share in the housing of the people. This being so, we are entitled to be heard as witnesses to the need for more drastic measures, such as changes in the land laws or the exercise of compulsory powers by municipal authorities. Just so, when we have discovered that any beneficent scheme of co-operative work is checked by bad laws or inefficient administration we are in duty bound to put our experience at the service of the authorities, and to use every lawful means for destroying the evil. Here are solid grounds which will satisfy the most impartial politician in our ranks that the movement cannot hold itself aloof from public affairs. It is, at least, a better justification of political action than the ingenious suggestion that we occupy the place of a large number of private tradesmen, many of whom have been engaged in public business."

These are somewhat lengthy extracts, but it is well that in regard to this new development the co-operators should be allowed to speak for themselves.

The resolutions passed by the Congress show how intelligent and practical is the interest taken by the co-operators in political matters. Sound and to the point were the resolutions on corruption in trade, on the "Anti-Education Bill," on the early closing of shops, on the nationalisation of railways, on international arbitration, &c.; but those to which we would direct special attention are the resolutions on land tenure, old-age pensions, and the sugar tax. These resolutions read as follows:

"LAND TENURE.

"Recognising that the condition of the Land Laws in this country makes it impossible to accomplish many of the reforms most urgently needed in connection with the lives of working people; and that these laws also block the way for national, municipal, industrial, and commercial progress, by reason of the power vested in landowners to dictate terms detrimental to public interests; and further, that under such conditions the landowner obtains an undue and unearned advantage in connection with industrial enterprises, this Congress urges the necessity for immediate legislation on the question, so as to facilitate the acquisition of land under fair and reasonable conditions for all purposes of industrial and social reform, with the view eventually of bringing the land under the control of the nation for use in the best interests of the people."

"OLD-AGE PENSIONS.

"That this Congress, strengthened by the overwhelming opinion as expressed by co-operative conferences held during the year, hereby declares the urgent necessity of Parliament providing an old-age pension for every citizen, male and female."

"SUGAR TAX.

"That this Congress deplores the action of the Government in putting a tax on sugar, which in its action is mainly a tax on the working-class household. It declares in favour of a free breakfast-table, and considers that the increase in the normal expenditure of the country of £30,000,000 a year is unwarrantable and unjustifiable."

These resolutions we have singled out because they relate to matters of finance, and because, while in regard to most reforms it is only too true that "the House of Lords blocks the way," in regard

to financial reforms it is demonstrably false. In 1678 the House of Commons passed the following resolution—we have quoted it before, but it is very necessary that it should be kept constantly in evidence :

"That all aids and supplies, and aids to his Majesty in Parliament are the sole gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants; *which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords.*"—*House of Commons Journals*, vol. ix. p. 509.

"It is upon this principle," says the greatest authority upon Parliamentary law (Sir Erskine May),¹ "that all proceedings between the two Houses, on matters of supply, are now founded. The principle is acquiesced in by the House of Lords;" and Lord Halsbury, the present Tory Lord Chancellor, admitted (April 2, 1897) that it has been the law of Parliament for upwards of two centuries.

The connection between the resolution on land tenure and matters financial is not very obvious on the face of it, but that connection is brought out in the report submitted by the Central Board to the Congress.

Land tenure is the first of a series of "special subjects" presented for consideration by the delegates, and in submitting it to the Conference the Board give such an admirable and suggestive summary of the whole question that we may be pardoned if we quote it in full :

"On the suggestion of the Joint Parliamentary Committee the United Board decided to bring forward as a special subject for discussion at this Congress the question of 'Land Tenure.' In connection with nearly all the measures for reform which from time to time come before Parliament, it is found in the experience of the Parliamentary Committee that the question of land tenure lies at the root of the evil which the measure of reform is intended to remove. This is especially the case in regard to the housing of the poor, and the obtaining of land for cultivation by working people. In view of this we have thought it only right to give Congress the opportunity of discussing the subject in order that any influence which is possessed by the co-operative movement may be used in the right direction.

"The following points will, perhaps, be found useful in discussing the subject :

"(a) EVILS ARISING FROM THE PRESENT SYSTEM OF LAND TENURE.

"(1) The denial to the great mass of agricultural labourers of their democratic right of access to land on fair terms, with the result that their only choice is between, on the one hand, service at a wage which in some counties, e.g., Somerset, Wilts, Dorset, Norfolk and Suffolk, is as low as 10s. to 12s. per week; and, on the other hand, migration to the town labour markets or to the distant colonies.

"(2) The passing of large tracts of rural land out of cultivation despite

¹ *Law of Parliament*. Ninth Edition. Page 642.

the possibility of rearing thereon families of sturdy yeomen with a high standard of comfort and life.

"(3) The supply of cheap labour to the town labour market. The country labourer and his children migrate townwards in search of better conditions, with the result that the town labour market is periodically overstocked, and the rates of wages paid to the unskilled labour class kept at a level little greater than a bare subsistence one.

"(4) Land absolutely necessary for the healthy expansion of towns and industrial villages is held back until extravagant and inflated values are created. As a consequence, both overcrowding of people in houses and the overcrowding of houses on land are produced.

"(5) The exaction of heavy tolls on industry in the shape of mineral rents and royalties, wayleaves, &c.

"(6) The persistence of poverty, despite the continual discovery of new methods of production and the consequent advance of national wealth; for, whilst the power to produce thus rapidly increases, the tolls levied by the owners of land increase in a similar, and, in some cases, an even greater degree, thus keeping great masses of the people permanently poor.

"(7) The diversion into private hands, in the form of land rent, of that portion of the national wealth produced as a result of the co-operative life of communities gathered together in cities and villages for the purposes of social and industrial development.

"(b) TO SECURE PRACTICAL STEPS TOWARDS THE UTILISATION OF THE LAND FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE PEOPLE: SUGGESTED LINE OF ACTION.

"(1) The granting to all urban local authorities full powers to acquire and hold land in any quantity for any purpose, and under compulsion, at a price based on the assessment of such land to taxation.

"Advantages of this: Communities can then—

"(a) Encourage the full and healthy expansion of town life.

"(b) Render municipal land available for healthy homes for industrial workers, industrial development, garden cities, &c.

"(c) Provide parks, playgrounds, &c.

"(d) Secure an ever-increasing revenue for purposes of public benefit.

"(e) Destroy the speculative, as distinct from the real, value of land, and compel the fair payment of public burdens.

"(2) The strengthening of the powers possessed by rural authorities, and the creation of special Land Boards, in order to secure to the agricultural labourer and farmer the right to obtain land at fair rents, with security of tenure, under a democratic authority.

"The community can by this means—

"(a) Help to develop a class of yeomen, co-operative farmers, with a high standard of comfort, co-operating to obtain all the advantages of machinery, whilst, at the same time, securing the advantages of thorough cultivation of the land.

"(b) Arrest the decay of agriculture, and, by making it desirable for the labourer to stay on the land, stop the flow townwards, and thus remove one of the elements of extreme competition amongst the unskilled workers in the town labour market.

"(c) Create on the land a home market for the product of industrial workers in the towns

"(3) The taxation of land values, in order to secure for purposes of general public benefit a share of the unearned increment now paid to those who possess land which has been rendered valuable by the industrial development of the whole community.

"CONCLUSION."

"By means of constitutional and fair means the placing of all land under complete democratic control. The first consideration then to be the use of the land in the interests of all the people, and the employment of the land rent created by the industry of the nation in such a way as to help on the moral, intellectual, and social development of the citizens composing the nation."

In regard to the "suggested line of action," however, we must point out that the Committee do not seem to realise how great and far-reaching are the results that would follow from the taxation of land values (including, of course, mineral rents and royalties). As a matter of fact the taxation of land values would not only secure all the benefits mentioned under heads 1 and 2, but *it is the only suggested method of reform that could not be blocked by the House of Lords.*

As has been practically demonstrated in New Zealand, New South Wales, Queensland, South Australia, Tasmania, &c., where the taxation of land values is now in force for national or local purposes, or both, the tax on land values, being levied upon the full value of all land, whether the land be put to use or not, tends to force all idle land into use, with the result that the exodus of labour from the country to the towns is stopped, the housing difficulty disappears, and with the fuller development of the agricultural districts a flourishing home market is created for town-made goods.

What a home market would be called into being by the full development of the agricultural districts of this country! Land reform at home would secure far more employment for our "surplus labour"—and a far better market for our "surplus goods" than any possible land-grabbing abroad—even could we annex the whole of Africa or the whole of China. Out of the 72,000,000 acres of this country no less than 26,000,000 are held absolutely idle, and 12,000,000 at least of these idle acres are capable of supporting with ease a family to every five or ten acres. Even with a family to every ten acres this means that, were land monopoly killed by a substantial tax on land values, some 1,200,000 families—6,000,000 people in all—would be drafted from the towns to the country. There would be 1,200,000 families the less competing for house room in towns, so that rents would be lower; 1,200,000 less competing for work, so that wages would be higher; and if the earnings of these families averaged only £1 a week—a low average, probably, for on Lord Carrington's estates the labourers, obtaining the land at the same rent as the farmers, can make a clear profit of 26s. to 30s. a week, working eight hours a day—that would mean for the products of the industrial workers in our towns a home market of no less than £62,400,000 a year! The development of such a market would again tend to raise the wages of town workers.

Moreover, the position of this country, in case of attack by a foreign power, would be greatly strengthened. In his article on "The Coming Reign of Plenty" (*Nineteenth Century*, June 1888), Prince Krapotkin showed that thirty years ago the United Kingdom, employing 750,000 more men on the land than at the present time, supported 24,000,000 people, instead of 17,000,000 on home-grown food; and he estimated that were the land properly cultivated it could readily produce food for a population of 70,000,000. There is, therefore, a possibility of a great future for co-operative agriculture; but, as in the case of the housing problem and in the industrial and commercial developments of urban life, it is essential that the land question be first solved.

It is unnecessary to say anything with regard to old-age pensions further than that in order to avoid any possible taint of pauperism it is absolutely necessary that, as stated in the resolution, the pensions should be extended to *every* person of pension age, and that the only source from which the necessary funds can be derived is land values.

In regard to the abnormal increase of ordinary national expenditure during the past five or six years the *Co-operative News* (June 8, 1901) points out that,

"taking each member to represent a family of only four persons, although the average family in Great Britain consists of five persons, the reader will perceive that one-sixth of the population is now enrolled in the co-operative ranks. Hence five millions yearly have been added in less than six years to the taxation of co-operators, and this takes more than two-thirds of the annual profits of the co-operative movement. It is, therefore, no wonder" (continues the editor) "that an intelligent congress decided in favour of a resolution which objected to the Government imposing such heavy burdens, and which threaten to become still heavier ones if the country does not raise its voice in protest. If the hollowness of party politics could be abolished, and the people could be educated to understand that the national government of this country is a co-operative institution, we might have some hope that co-operators would recognise their duty to take a living, active, and intelligent part in directing the affairs of . . . the 'body politic.'"

It is often said that, thanks to the war in South Africa, all such reforms as old age pensions, the housing of the working classes, and the abolition of the breakfast-table duties—all measures, in fact, requiring a great expenditure of money, have been put back for a quarter, if not for half a century. There is, however, no reason whatever in the nature of things why this should be so, and whether it shall be so or no depends entirely upon the workers of this country, for in the ultimate analysis it is the votes of the workers that decide all political questions. That being the case, the responsibility that rests upon co-operators is grave indeed.

Co-operators constitute the largest organised body of workers in the kingdom, they have vast funds at their disposal, during the past fifty years they have developed a trained administrative capacity

second to none, they have a first-hand knowledge of industrial and social problems, and should they place these great powers at the service of their poorer brethren they could accomplish a work for humanity far transcending even the great and important developments of the past half-century, and the diamond jubilee of the co-operative movement, three years hence, might well prove the inauguration of the People's Jubilee in this England of ours.

But it is important that this great force should take the line of least resistance. Only by so doing can the quickest, the best, and the most permanent results be obtained. And the line of least resistance is to be found in financial reform; for that, and that only, the Lords cannot block.

We would suggest, therefore, that the co-operators should concentrate on some such reforms as the following:

(1) A sound democratic budget, including:

(a) The abolition of the Rating Acts, or "Landlord Relief Acts," thus setting free £2,000,000 a year.

(b) The imposition on *present* values of the Land Tax of four shillings in the pound on "the full true yearly value of the land," now levied, thanks to landlord chicanery, on the values of two hundred years ago, and bringing in £750,000 only! The rental value of the land of this country is at least £200,000,000, so that a tax of four shillings in the pound on present values would realise £40,000,000.

(c) This £42,000,000 to be apportioned as follows:

(i) Payment of Members and of Election Expenses, £1,000,000;

(ii) Abolition of the Breakfast-table Duties, £5,000,000;

(iii) Old-age Pensions, five shillings a week to every person over the age of sixty-five, estimated by Mr. Chamberlain to cost £25,000,000;

(iv) To pay for the war, &c., in lieu of Sir Michael Hicks Beach's new taxes—the half-penny in the pound on sugar, the penny in the pound on the Income Tax, and the shilling per ton on exported coal—£11,000,000.

(2) A Bill giving local option as regards the taxation of land values, on the lines suggested by Lord Balfour of Burleigh, Lord Blair Balfour, Sir Edward Hamilton, Sir George Murray and Mr. James Stuart (the experts of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation) in their "Separate Report on Urban Rating and Site Values," or on the lines of the Rating on Unimproved (Land) Values Acts of New Zealand and South Australia.

These are reforms worth working for, reforms that will secure to the workers great, immediate, far-reaching, and permanent benefits. What are the co-operators going to do about it? Will they put their shoulders to the wheel?

A tithe only of the annual profit divided amongst the members would mean upwards of £774,000, and with that sum it would be

possible to contest, if necessary, every constituency in the United Kingdom at a cost of £1000 a piece, and yet leave a balance of £100,000 for the payment of members until that duty was undertaken by the State. But, should that method of providing the sinews of war be objected to, then if each of the 1,700,000 members were to put by loyally only a penny per week the campaign fund would amount in one year to some £368,000; in two years to £736,000; and in three years, the date of the co-operative diamond jubilee, to £1,104,000. Even should the General Election take place one year after the fund had been started it would be possible to fight four hundred seats at a cost of £500 each, and yet leave a balance of £168,000 for the payment of members and of election expenses and to meet the cost of collecting, organising, and administering the fund.

In short, given the will, and surely in view of the death-in-life endured by the denizens of our slums, by the victims of the sweating system, and by the unfortunate inmates of our "Poor Law Bastiles," the will cannot long be wanting—given the will, co-operators have the power, in men, in votes, and in money, to thoroughly democratise the political life of this country, and by so doing to obtain such reforms, social and industrial, as will secure to all equality of opportunity—opportunity to live a life worth the living—opportunity to attain to a physical, intellectual, and moral stature worthy of the best traditions of our race, worthy of that Twentieth Century upon which we have just entered.

THE RUSSO-CHINESE IMBROGLIO.

I.—EXTERNAL RELATIONS.

THE basis of the Russo-Chinese policy, as manifested in the more or less vague treaties or conventions promulgated by the Tsar's Government for the benefit of "neutral" Powers—and worded, if I may quote the phrase of an eminent Russian statesman, "*à ne pas exciter la jalousie de nos ennemis, et surtout celle de nos chers amis les français*"—was laid at St. Petersburg during the national celebrations in honour of the coronation of his Imperial Majesty Nicholas II.

The secret treaty known as the Cassini Convention, signed in 1896 and made public in the following year, by no means reveals the full nature and extent of the agreement arrived at between the two Powers; but it was more far-reaching than is realised even now, and was fraught with consequences of which no one can foresee the issue. In addition to the Manchurian railway and mining concessions, the establishment of military depôts at Kirin and elsewhere, the occupation of Port Arthur and Talienwan and other privileges in Manchuria, it included a fifteen years' lease of the east coast and bay of the Shantung Peninsula, since occupied by Germany and Great Britain—the former at Kiao-Chau, the latter at Wei-Hai-Wei—thus giving Russia the command of the Gulf of Pechili and of the approaches to Taku, Tient'sin and Peking. The occupation of the Shantung Peninsula was, however, deferred until the completion of the fortifications at Port Arthur and Talienwan, and of the Trans-Siberian and Manchurian railways, should give Russia the preponderating influence necessary to enable her to support China effectively in resisting the aggression of other interested Powers. The inclusion in the secret convention of the article respecting Kiao-Chau proved fatal to the prospects of the offensive and defensive alliance, for such it actually was, but more especially to Russian prestige in the Far East.

Great as China's sacrifices may now appear, as set forth from the Russian point of view in the Cassini Convention, they by no means indicate the full extent to which China was committed prior to the resignation of the Emperor. . But, on the other hand, whatever may have been the nature of Russo-Chinese relations subsequent to the

Treaty of Peking that ceded Kiao-Chau to Germany, the main principle of the agreement was originally one of mutual co-operation involving no sacrifice of Chinese interests, which Russia, on her side, was pledged to respect and defend. What are now referred to as concessions, in a sense implying more than is consistent with the maintenance of the empire's territorial integrity, had quite another significance in Chinese eyes prior to the advent of Germany as a factor in the situation. This event completely revolutionised the condition of affairs. China is not accustomed to disinterestedness on the part of foreign Powers; but she expects the fulfilment of pledges, and the pledges made by Russia were equivalent in importance to the concessions made by China. The disasters of the Japanese war rendered a powerful alliance highly desirable, as a means of putting an end to the system of aggression initiated by the Treaty of Shimonoseki; but an alliance that did not ensure this result was worthless. China's sole stipulation, in return for the sacrifices involved in meeting the requirements of her ally, was armed support in resisting the demands of other Powers. The terms were viewed with suspicion by the *Literati*; but the Government had to choose between co-operation and conflict with a powerful neighbour. The French in the south had joined hands with the Russians in the north; the Franco-Russian alliance was an accomplished fact; Great Britain had deserted China in the hour of defeat; with whom, then, could an alliance be concluded, if not with the most powerful neighbour? The less of two evils was accepted with resignation: but the concessions were made to a friendly ally, not to an aggressive enemy. The forts and harbours of Port Arthur, Talienwan and Kiao-Chau were leased to Russia, but they were to be conjointly occupied by the land and marine forces of the two Powers; in permitting Russia to establish military depôts throughout Manchuria, China reserved the right to purchase them at the end of a definite period, when her loan obligations had been discharged. The Chinese territorial army of Manchuria was not to be diminished or withdrawn, but increased, in the northern and eastern military districts, and brought up to the European standard by Russian instructors under the supreme command of the Chinese Generalissimo. Officers of the rising generation were to study the art of war at the military colleges in Russia, instead of, as hitherto, at the Hanlyn College, an institution of an essentially scholastic character. Such was the programme of the alliance of the two empires prior to the intervention of Germany. The terms, as understood at the time, were mutually advantageous.

While both Powers were pledged to co-operate in the reorganisation of the army, and in the construction of fortifications necessary to ensure the safety of the empire, so also was the exploitation of the resources of the country to be conducted on the same principle of

co-operation. As pendants to the Cassini Convention, several commercial and railway treaties were projected, with the object of gradually eliminating the competition of rival Powers, the decline of whose commerce, it was believed, would facilitate the acquisition by Russo-Chinese syndicates (through the operation of the newly established bank) of foreign enterprises, together with the control of the railways in Chi-li, Shantung and Shansi. It did not become apparent at this time that the object of Russia was to get the wealthy Chinese to invest their money in projects that would work out to her exclusive advantage without unduly taxing her financial resources; that she had in view merely the acquisition or construction of lines connecting Mukden with Peking, and others running southward through Shantung, Shansi and Honan, to make the Bay of Hankow the *débouchure* of the Trans-Siberian-Trans-Manchurian-Trans-Chinois Railway. New armaments were to be imported, a new navy constructed, and, while undue friction was to be avoided until a period of prosperity had strengthened Russia's financial position, and enabled her to fill her military granaries, depleted for years owing to the frequent famines and the necessity of forcing the sale abroad of the only marketable commodity produced by the labour of the masses of the people, the Russo-Chinese alliance, when the fitting moment arrived, was to dominate the Far East with its combined resources in men and supplies. It must be borne in mind that the action of Germany was utterly unforeseen; Russo-German relations were supposed to be of the most friendly character.

The failure of Russia to prevent the occupation of territory to which she had prior claim was even more fatal to her prestige than her non-intervention in defence of Chinese integrity. The "Lord of Peace is dethroned, and the Lord of War reigns in his stead!" exclaimed a Chinese Minister, when it was announced that the Crown Prince of Germany was to be received in audience by the Emperor, the Emperor-Elect¹ and the Dowager-Empress. The fact that Germany had become a factor in the situation was fully recognised in Peking. Japan concluded that what Germany could do with three ships at Kiao-Chau she with a whole fleet ought to be able to accomplish in Korea.²

¹ Son of Prince Tuan.

² It was rumoured in Berlin at the time of Germany's occupation of Kiao-Chau, that unofficial representations were made to Germany to the effect that Russia had acquired prior right to the eastern shore of the Shantung Peninsula; and that Germany's reply was to the effect that treaties not officially communicated to Powers whose interests are involved, cannot be officially recognised. However this may be, the importance attached to the possession of the Shantung Peninsula, and the nature of the rebuff to Russia, is fully set forth from the standpoint of the Franco-Russian Alliance by the author of *La Russie qui S'ouvre*, who observes, "the road of Port Arthur opens almost at the extremity of the Liaotung Peninsula; it was therefore important for the Russians to assure themselves the entrance to the Gulf of Pechili, and occupy a position that would prevent any other Power installing herself in the Shantung Peninsula. They received the right to acquire on lease for fifteen

Having failed to support her ally against foreign aggression, Russia became transformed from the powerful friend into the bullying creditor. She now intimated her intention of occupying Port Arthur permanently, owing to Chinese compliance in the occupation of Kiao-Schau! and when at this time the Emperor of China signified his desire to construct a railway from Peking to Mukden, it was vetoed by Russia, who intimated her intention of constructing one from Mukden to Peking.

If the concessions made to Russia were regarded with suspicion by the great body of Chinese statesmen, even by those who considered a powerful alliance necessary, the failure thereof to secure China from further aggression on the part of other Powers, stirred the whole social organisation of the empire, and awoke a feeling of extraordinary bitterness against the foreigner. The disasters foreseen in the Russophile policy, following on those of the Japanese War and the seizure of Kiao-Schan, resulted in the intervention of the Board of Censors who procured the resignation of the Emperor. At the same time a national policy was being evolved by the great governing body of *Literati*, who, being mostly members of the Imperial College, are bound by the closest ties to the Board of Censors and other representatives of this national institution. The main object of the new movement was the re-organisation of the land forces; the reconciliation of conflicting interests, that had too long kept the empire divided; and passive resistance to foreign aggression of all kinds, until such time as China could reassert her power. The tension produced by this merging of the political forces of the empire, resulted in the explosion of 1900, a popular movement that involved the sober and more enlightened element in the common ruin; while the national policy, being brought into conflict with that of the central government, all but resulted in civil war.

This division was brought about by the intrigues of the Russophile party who still maintained their influence at Peking; and incredible as it may seem, in view of the fiasco that resulted from the secret alliance of 1896-1898, its renewal in a modified form resulted from the Russophile revival in the autumn of 1899, on terms that would have proved disastrous to China had the conditions of the treaty been fulfilled.

In Western Europe no more is apparently known of this secret alliance than of that concluded at St. Petersburg when the Chinese Ministers were under the spell of the liberal and magnificent reception accorded them by the Tsar's Ministers, and the Peking Govern-

years the magnificent bay of Kiao-Chan on the east coast of the peninsula *et de l'occuper* (presumably the shore) *militairement.*" The same writer observes that "the treaty conferring these advantages on Russia being secret, and not therefore communicated to the great Powers . . . *officiellement, le gouvernement allemand l'ignorait et pouvait se dispenser d'en tenir compte.*" (*La Russie qui S'ouvre*, pp. 48, 49.)

ment was hypnotised by the Franco-Russia Alliance. The general impression in Europe would seem to be that China is willing to give away provinces, either for the mere asking, in recognition of Russia's traditional friendship, or to prevent them being taken by force, although no such attempt has been made by Russia or is likely to be made in the present state of international politics. This were surely an imbecile policy! and yet there are absolutely no reasons why China should relinquish her sovereignty over any portion of her territory, for the concessions set forth in the treaty of 1896 are more than ample security for the loan. There is no basis for the preposterous claims of Russia other than "traditional friendship," and China derives no advantage whatever from the transaction either actual or prospective; there is no *quid pro quo*—such would seem to be the obtuse reasoning of the "neutral powers" as they are called by the Russians. Surely nothing could be more absurd; and yet this conception of Russo-Chinese relations is obviously the basis of British policy. Russia in fact without the shadow of a legitimate claim, without a precedent in the history of international relations, without so much as putting forth the loss of a single missionary as a plea, can consistently with the reign of traditional friendship, and without danger to its continuance, demand the cession of a few provinces from a friendly power. And the Chinese Government is only prevented from complying by external pressure!

If the only pressure exerted had come from without, the Manchurian treaty had been signed long since. Of the pressure exerted from within I shall presently reveal the nature.

The *amour propre* of the Chinese Government is not even offended by these demands for territorial concessions—and Russia, whatever may be the nature of her dealings in other respects, knows better than to strike at this weak spot in the Chinese character. The same cannot be said of countries who make the balance of power in the Far East a plea for appropriating Chinese territory. If the Chinese Government—I mean the pro-Russian advisers and their supporters—were averse from the Russophile policy; if Russia had no theoretical basis for the demands set forth in the Manchurian Convention, that remains at present unsigned, why is the whole matter not submitted to the Powers? Russia favours the principle of arbitration. Is it possible that Russia, even with the support of France, would face the united opposition of China and Japan, Great Britain and Germany, not to mention the United States and Italy? Undoubtedly all these powers would support China in repudiating Russian demands—both those set forth in the Manchurian Convention and others not mentioned therein—did China make a definite declaration of policy. Were the advantage to be derived from the Russo-Chinese secret treaty not of a reciprocal character; were the conventions merely one-

sided, would the traditional friendship of the Russian and Peking Governments remain undisturbed—recent events on the Amur notwithstanding?

Of course there was, and probably still is, a *quid pro quo* provided for, of a nature satisfactory enough to the Russophiles and a tottering dynasty; and, of course, there is a theoretical basis for Russia's otherwise preposterous demands: viz., the secret alliance treaty of 1899 which was even referred to vaguely by the Russian Minister during the Tientsin Railway dispute as a prior agreement. This prior agreement was the commercial and railway pendant to the treaty of 1896 referred to above which was also renewed in the treaty of 1899. With the commercial aspects of this treaty, important and far-reaching as they are, I do not propose to deal.¹

The formulation of the Manchurian Convention itself was only due to the impossibility of making public the terms of the alliance or conspiracy without acquainting the world with the part played by Russia during the anti-foreign troubles. The anti-foreign movement in Chili, Shansi, Shantung, &c., precipitated the anti-Russian movement on the Amur; but the organisations that promoted them and the object in view, were in each case of an entirely different character. Indeed, the anti-foreign movement was in a large measure due to the intrigues of Russian political agents, Chinese and foreign—as most well-informed Chinamen know, though few would care to acknowledge it—at a time when popular feeling was aroused by foreign aggression.

I shall presently show the advantages Russia hoped to derive from the temporary expulsion of foreigners.

The anti-Russian movement which aimed at rendering Russian neutrality during the anti-foreign rising impossible² and bringing about the collapse of the Russophile party was of an entirely different character; and the imbroglio—the secret history of which it is my purpose to reveal—resulted from the conflict of an organised national policy now backed by the political forces of the whole empire, with the Russophile policy now supported by a minority powerful only by virtue of their office and the support of the mighty ally.³

II.—POLITICAL FORCES.

The continual transformation of China's external policy since the treaty of Shimonoseki ended the Japanese invasion, might lead the foreigner acquainted only with the surface effects, produced by the

¹ Reference is made to them above on p. 151.

² This was one of the features of the treaty.

³ The pressure brought to bear by the supporters of the national policy is manifested in many important changes in the central government and in imperial edicts recently issued. Although the Russophiles maintain their place they are compelled to conform outwardly to the national policy that threatens to crush them and assuredly will.

conflict of political forces of which he generally knows nothing, to suppose an organised national policy to be non-existent, and the "break up" of China assured.

"When the power of the empire is long divided it shall be united,
When long united it shall be divided."

Such is the popular maxim, enunciated in times of old by a Chinese philosopher; and there is something of prophecy in the utterance, which, however, probably originated in a clear perception of the nature of the bonds that hold the peoples of China together, and have enabled the empire to survive the rise and fall of nearly all the powerful nations of Europe and Asia. China has been, and may again be invaded, even conquered: but by virtue of the national code of ethical principles, which permeate the whole social system, it invariably follows that the conquerors are absorbed, and that what survives the process of transmutation is Chinese. It is two hundred years since China came under the Ts'ing dynasty, but, in all important particulars, not only have Chinese customs and manners survived, but Chinese customs and language have penetrated into the heart of Manchuria, where the original dialect is rarely heard save among the mountain clans.

China has survived the invasion of the Mohammedans of Central Asia; of the *Ta-tse* who in the fourteenth century over-ran half Europe, and, as late as the sixteenth century, exacted tribute from the Muscovites. All this points to a vitality and potentiality inherent in the social system, far more effective in maintaining national integrity than the mutually destructive shock of arms.

More remarkable is this bond of unity I have referred to, if we look into the constitution of the country and find how slight is the control of the central government over the eighteen provinces and external dependencies. Every provincial department has its own administration, and a territorial army under the absolute command of a governor-general, who, so far as the people under his rule are concerned, is the supreme head of affairs. The middle kingdom might be defined as a confederation of self-governing States, save that the word "confederation" implies a political union that one might look for in vain in China.¹

The payment of contributions to the Board of Revenues; the promulgation of Imperial edicts dispatched by the Board of Civil Appointments, and transactions of less importance with the Board of Public Works and other departments of the Civil Service, represent a sum of obligations the non-fulfilment of which would bring the provincial governors to the notice of the central government. The indissoluble bond of unity which holds the eighteen provinces

¹ If there is an absence of political relations between the departments, there is equally a total absence of restrictions on intercourse.

together is obviously not to be found in the political constitution of the country. It is, therefore, necessary that I should digress somewhat in order to define the nature of the political forces of the Chinese Empire, before I venture to give a detailed account of the events that resulted in the final break-up of the Russo-Chinese Alliance, and in the conflict between the national policy and that of the central government.

The government of China is commonly referred to as an absolute despotism; but the term is misleading. The Chinese Government does not resemble that of any other nation. Behind the Emperor is the extensive organisation of which the members of the Board of Censors and privy councillors are the active representatives. These officials have power to veto any act of the Emperor, public or private, that is inconsistent with the regulations laid down in the national code¹ and the book of rites and ceremonies; and against the decrees of the Board of Censors there is no appeal. Not only do they preside at the Privy Council and at each of the Government departments or boards, but the so-called viceroys and plenipotentiaries who travel through all the provinces to examine into the conduct of the officials, punish the corrupt and recommend the deserving to the Imperial favour,² are in reality grand inquisitors or supervisors who belong to the same body. Behind the Board of Censors is the Hanlyn College, of which most of the public censors are members. The competitive examinations of this institution provide officials for practically the whole empire—which is thus governed by an aristocracy of letters. The Hanlyn or Imperial or Great College has been described as the pivot of the empire; and it is certainly the pivot of the Government organisation. No sooner is the heir presumptive to the throne nominated than he is given over to the control of a board of the representatives of the Imperial College, *i.e.*, the *Chan-shih-fu*, who initiate him in his future duties as High Priest; and on his accession he must present himself at the college to receive the heavy charge of duties, which he is bound to fulfil in accordance with an inflexible code administered under the supervision of the *Tuck'a-yuan* and the *Ta-hsio-shih*.

Moreover, it is laid down as a principle in the classics—in accordance with which the constitution of the country is determined—that the people are of the most importance in the State and the ruler of the least. This assertion was made by Mencius, who, furthermore declared that not only is it right for the people to depose an incapable or unworthy ruler, but it is their duty to do so. Moreover, the Emperor, although high-priest of the empire, and in this capacity possessed of much moral influence, does not command the army, and the power manifested in his acts is in reality vested

¹ The five Ching, or King.

² They have even power to inflict the death penalty.

in his ministers. To initiate a policy of his own, he would have to dispose of the whole governing body: and this is next to impossible, since they have the power—and, if they disapprove of his acts, the right—to dispose of him.

Behind the Hanlyn College is the great body of *Literati*; who, as I have observed, occupy all official posts in and under the Government, and are bound together by the closest ties of common interest and *esprit de corps*. As a political body they have naturally considerable influence. Outside this charmed circle of all that is learned and venerable are the unlettered and labouring classes, who are under the absolute control and influence of the administrators of the law, *i.e.*, of the *Literati*.

The bond of union, however, which holds together the lettered and unlettered classes alike, lies deeper in the national life; for of the great body of *Literati* few are really initiated in the mysteries contained in the *Yi-king* and other books that constitute the national code that may be said to condition Chinese existence—that controls the actions of the sovereign and determines the most insignificant details in the daily lives of the people.

Nearly all social customs in China differ from those of other nations in having a definite meaning. They partake of the nature of rites and ceremonies. The number of provinces into which the empire was originally divided, the number of ko-tows made to an official or divinity, the number of blows meted out to a criminal, have an occult significance and are determined strictly in accordance with a national system based on a theory of numbers that has a close affinity with the doctrines of Pythagoras. Every custom of the people, insignificant as it may appear to the foreigner, has a special meaning for the Chinaman, who regulates his life in accordance with the national code, that, in the absence of anything corresponding to an ecclesiastical hierarchy, is determined by ethical societies which represent the various grades of initiation in the mysteries of the system guarded by the Grand Council of the "Triad," a hermetic society whose proceedings are shrouded in mystery.

Most people have heard of the "White Lily," the "Golden Orchid," the "Red Caps," the "Yellow Caps," the "League of Righteous Harmony," and kindred local societies, or rather sects, who not infrequently assume the names of the *Chiu Kung*, *Pa-Kua*, or "The Nine Palaces and Eight Diagrams Society," the "Hung-League," or "Heaven and Earth League," and even the "Triad," with which the Heaven and Earth League is generally identified, owing to the doctrine of the one representing a degree of initiations into that of the other. These societies are of quite another kind, and their object is the discovery and preservation of moral and religious truth irrespective of creed. Among their

members are to be found the most intellectual and many of the most powerful officials in the empire—sometimes including the Emperor.¹

These societies, although ethical in character and maintaining a neutral attitude towards politics and religion in times of peace, in defence of their code become transformed into active political bodies, and to ignore their influence in dealing with Chinese politics, would be like ignoring Parliamentary and ecclesiastical institutions in dealing with the Governments of western countries.

The Chinese Empire is then comparable to a vast free-masonry which is manifested in all material, spiritual and social relations; and every individual, from the baby in its cradle, whose progress in knowledge is initiation in the mysteries of the social code, to the members of the Grand Council of the "Triad," is a mason. All sections of the community are thus bound together, though strictly subordinated in grades, by the closest ties—which become fetters for the individual who struggles against them.

The Chinaman lives up to his system. For him the visible universe is a spiritual manifestation of which he regards himself and his ancestors as a part; he identifies himself with the particular locality in which he was born and in which he desires to be buried; and this locality is an integral part of the Middle Kingdom which is the centre of the Universe.² His chief object in life is to unite in himself the harmony of heaven and earth. The very divisions of the empire are determined in accord-

¹ The highest but one in importance is the "Hung-league" or the "League of Heaven, Earth and Man," in the cardinal doctrine of which western sinologues have discovered only a cosmological theory, whereas it is but a veil for the mysteries of the "Triad," a metaphysical doctrine between which and the cardinal tenet of the Christian faith in its profoundest significance, many Chinese scholars have been unable to discover a distinction.

The *Pa-Kua* Society determines all the social conditions of the empire. On the other hand, the Hung-league, whose influence extends from India to the China seas, from the Amur, or river of the Black Dragon, to Singapore, determines the famous *Fung-Shui* code in accordance with which all actions are regulated from the most trivial to the most important of everyday life.

As Monsieur Reville observes (*La Religion Chinoise*, pp. 626-7) in building houses or tombs all is subordinated to the principles of a complicated art known as the *Fung-Shui*. The lines and undulations of the earth, and those of the horizon, and the conjunction in the normal proportion of the element water and the element wood and the element earth, and of that which appertains to the nature male and to the nature female. A good site for building should present three-fifths of the character male, and two-fifths of the character female, and the locality is frequently modified to attain this result. It is necessary that the houses inhabited by the mandarins should be higher than those of simple subjects, and that the height of those which are equal should be carefully determined. The door giving access to the rooms should not open at a right angle, and the windows should be pierced in propitious facades. It is prudent also to examine the tiles of a neighbouring house to see that their influence does not cross the effects produced by the *Fung-Shui* of houses built in accordance with its rules. Severe penalties are inflicted on those who construct houses of which the disposition alters the *Fung-Shui* of those pre-existing.

² This spiritual and monistic conception of the universe is well expressed in the following remarkable passage from the works of Chao-he: "Though you speak of Heaven, earth and man, there is but one spirit that supports them; though you speak of individuals and distinguish one from another, yet there is but one spirit which is the essence of all. My spirit is identical with that of my ancestors."

ance with his system, and he would rather endure the martyrdom of "a thousand cuts"¹ than that any part thereof should be ceded to an alien race.

Such is the nature of the social organisation and the indissoluble union that, notwithstanding diversity in race and religion, holds together the peoples of China, and, to a more or less extent, the peoples of Asia. This social system constitutes all that is to be understood by nationality; the defence thereof is all that is to be understood by politics; and the united effort of the 400 millions that inhabit China, Manchuria, Mongolia and Tibet—not mentioning the active co-operation of other peoples of Central Asia—represents the political forces of the empire. The societies that control these forces, though ethical in character, become active political bodies in the maintenance of their national code; and they have a unanimous following that no mere political system on the model of those of Western states could produce. Europeans talk of the conquest of Asia, of its subordination to Western civilisation, and forget that Asia was the cradle, not only of Western civilisation, but of the Western nations—and it may yet prove their grave.

The complications that resulted from the Japanese War—more especially the German occupation of Kiao-Chau, the failure of the Russophile policy to prevent the aggression of other Powers, the transformation of Russia's attitude towards China, and the resignation of the Emperor—caused a wave of unrest, apprehension, and discontent to pass over the empire. But it required the march of the Allies on Peking, the flight of the Court to Si-gnan-fu, and the desecration of the Sacred City to bring about the merging of opposing forces in support of a definite national policy and something approaching the equilibrium of divergent elements that produces strength.

The foregoing sketch of the constitution of Chinese society necessarily deals rather with the principles that condition facts than the facts themselves, and prior to the foreign invasion the power of the empire was still divided. Hence the ill-advised outbreaks in Chili, Shansi and Shantung, and the premature rising against Russia on the Amur, neither of which movements had the full support that may be looked for in similar circumstances should China be forced to awaken the slumbering dragon of war in defence of the empire's integrity.

As I have already stated, the anti-foreign movement was confined to the popular sects; extensive as were its effects, it was merely of a local character that awakened sympathy, but little actual support in the interior. It was nothing more than a local explosion resulting from the tension of national feeling produced by the events I have described, combined with the disturbing influence exerted by

¹ A form of punishment for political offences.

Russian secret agents, which include a large number of Chinese Russophiles and their supporters.

Intercourse between China and most foreign Powers is conducted through the agency of the Tsung-li-yamen, with the official representatives, but Russian diplomacy has features peculiar to itself. Very few measures are put forward by either side that have not been previously discussed in private by individual members of the respective Governments or by subordinate agents thereof. Difficulties are met and overcome and the way paved for official action, which thus becomes of a formal character. The State machinery being well oiled wherever necessary, works smoothly, and Russian diplomacy gets credit for overcoming obstacles that are in reality removed from its path.

These semi-official agents and political adventurers are to be found almost everywhere in the north-eastern and southern provinces. Not only do they enter into relations with individual members of the central government, but with the governors of provinces, political malcontents, and even with the secret supporters of the Ming dynasty. They are not infrequently commercial agents in search of markets for Russian produce, railway engineers and surveyors, merchants, &c., who add to the incomes derived from their legitimate vocations by making politics their avocation. They acquire and supply to the Government departments with which they happen to be connected information of considerable value, and are not infrequently entrusted with enterprises of a political nature, the successful accomplishment of which not infrequently brings them to the favourable notice of the Tsar's Government, which, however, can repudiate their proceedings and deny all official knowledge thereof whenever it may be convenient to do so. What Russia accomplishes in Europe by means of her official publications, dispersed abroad in foreign languages, she achieves by means of her secret agents in China; so that the Chinaman hears practically only one side of the controversy of the Powers, and that the most favourable to Russia and the most damaging to her rivals. Even at the present time it is the common belief that Great Britain and Germany are only awaiting a favourable opportunity to appropriate Chinese territory wholesale, and that Russia is the sole check to their aggression. This view is partly supported by cuttings from English and American papers translated into Chinese, and not infrequently distorted in the process. These agents were particularly busy in the autumn of 1899, and the extraordinary reports of the decline of Great Britain, not only as a military, but also as a naval, Power, are traceable to their influence.

The perilous position of the United Kingdom in the midst of a hostile Europe dominated by the Franco-Russian alliance, into which Germany could have no choice but to enter, and the impend-

ing coalition that was to completely revolutionise the relative importance of the great Powers, were set forth with considerable skill and illustrated by maps and charts, showing the relative size of each country. These rumours were partly corroborated by the Chinese residents in foreign capitals. Even the action of Russia in not opposing the occupation of Kiao-Chau by Germany was explained by reference to a prior agreement between these two Powers, directed against Great Britain; and absurd as this may seem, in view of recent events, I can only say it was generally believed.

The St. Petersburg Government, by means of her skilfully organised system of propagating Russophile doctrines through all grades of social life, endeavoured, and with no little success, to make it manifest that against Russia, China could do nothing, with Russia everything; that the preservation of the reigning dynasty and of the goods and chattels, perhaps the lives, of the Russophiles, was dependent on the support of the mighty ally; and on the successful prosecution of the mutual policy, from which there could be no going back, depended the safety of those who initiated it. No less was it made clear to the leaders of the anti-foreign movement, when the troubles broke out, that the destruction or expulsion of the foreigners could be easily accomplished by the millions of China if the neutrality of Russia could be secured.

It was, however, beginning to be recognised that in the hour of danger — especially when her own interests were at stake — Russia's help was not forthcoming. The nationalists knew full well that all Russia aimed at was the distintegration of the Middle Kingdom and the temporary expulsion of the foreigners, so that she might intervene and pose as at once the saviour of China and the preserver of European interests and conduct from Peking the negotiations for a settlement which would leave her just so much power over China as it would be safe for her to claim.

It was about this time—in October or November, 1899—that the first intimation of the existence of the secret alliance was made to the leaders of the nationalist party; and although subsequent versions were conflicting as to matters of detail, they all agreed as regards the main issues. It was reported that practically the whole of Chinese territory north of the Great Wall had been ceded to Russia in return for certain guarantees. This report was at first contradicted, but although it transpired that Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan and Manchuria were to remain nominally Chinese territory, the army of Manchuria was to be replaced by Russian troops, and the Chinese commanders by Russian governors-general. Russia was pledged to support the reigning family against any complications in China; and, should the expected rebellion assume a serious character, intervene and assist in maintaining order. On the other hand, while the national movement proved to be of an exclusively anti-foreign

character, Russia was pledged to neutrality, and, in the event of its being successful, and the foreigners being driven out of Shantung and Shansi, to support China in the resulting complications with Western Powers, and hold her army ready at Port Arthur to co-operate with the Chinese Government in discussing terms of peace from Peking. It was believed that the only trouble likely to occur was with Germany, as the whole of the British forces were supposed to be invested by the Boers in South Africa. But as Germany was represented as Russia's friend and ally, it was believed that all differences could be adjusted. The subsequent events at Peking were unforeseen; the Government forces were well under control of their respective leaders, and, although it seemed impossible to stem the tide of anti-foreign feeling, it was fully expected that the foreigners would evacuate the country without offering opposition. The Chinese forces massed at strategic positions—as, for instance, Taku, which was believed to be impregnable—were to act solely on the defensive in preventing the foreigners return. It was unforeseen that the supporters of the Russophile policy would be left with little or no following. They depended on the support of the Manchus and commanders of the provincial army corps; but the Manchus made common cause with the Chinese, when it became known that the integrity of China north of the Great Wall was involved.¹

My knowledge respecting the details of the secret treaty of November, 1899, is based on conflicting reports of persons whose authority is equally reliable; but as I have an extensive acquaintance with the proceedings of the national organisations, proceedings deliberately planned and executed with the sole object of rendering Russian neutrality impossible and making the treaty null and void, I am enabled to arrive at an approximate estimate of the nature of the secret treaty. It has been suggested by some that the agreement was not formally signed; that it was entered into by subordinate officials without the sanction of the Russian Government. Others state as positively that the Government sanction was dependent on the success or failure of the anti-foreign movement. This theory was plausible, but subsequent events have shown it to be untenable. Russia has made extraordinary efforts to fulfil her part of the agreement, which is the only basis of her preposterous claims to Chinese territory. Notwithstanding the united opposition of the Nationalists, manifested even in the policy of the central government, she has never wavered in her protestations of friendship. While her troops were engaged in wanton bloodshed, the Russian Government, finding the Russophiles to be powerful only by virtue of their office, and the power of the Chinese Empire to be at the back of the Nationalist leaders, endeavoured to maintain its grasp on China by

¹ This treaty was, according to all accounts, concluded by Li Hung-Chang and Count Muraviev.

interceding on behalf of the very men who initiated and organised the invasion of her territory on the Amur. The other Powers, by clamouring for vengeance, have actively assisted Russia in the attainment of this object; but the powerful leaders of the anti-foreign movement are above all things patriotic and disinterested, and they prefer the enmity of all Europe to the friendship of Russia. Their only reply to Russian overtures has been to organise preparations for a renewal of hostilities on a larger scale—in Manchuria, Mongolia and Chinese Turkestan—with the support, this time, of the Mahommedans of Russian Central Asia. The conflict of the *Tsing* and *Ming* dynasties has long kept the power of empire divided, but the dangers that threaten from without have brought about the reconciliation of opposing factions.

It would be a mistake to conclude that, because certain Manchurian officials had supported the Russians in their demands, they are backed by the Manchus as a class. Indeed, while the secret supporters of the *Ming* dynasty regard the cession of Manchuria to Russia as fatal to the reigning family, the Manchus—national sentiment apart—are bound to oppose it for the same reason. From the time the railway was projected through *Feng Tsin*, the Chinese inhabitants, who are now in the majority, and the Manchu clans, formed a powerful league known variously as the “Heavenly Brotherhood” and the “Heaven Ordained,”¹ so named after the province, *Feng Tsin*, where the founder of the *Tsing* dynasty was ordained by Heaven to rule over the middle kingdom. It was there he built the now ruined Temple of Heaven;² and within fifteen li from the three-walled city, i.e., Mukden, he was buried. The sacred character of the province, considered in relation with the religious and political character of the constitution—which makes the favour of heaven the sole title of a particular ruler to the throne—renders the retention of Manchuria under Chinese rule a vital necessity.

But there are considerations other than those of a purely sentimental character.

The people of Manchuria are thrifty, industrious and sober; they live by agriculture, which they regard as the only legitimate calling. “Evil spirits,” they say, “sleep with the metals in the earth; do not disturb them—they sow discord among men.” But even the qualities of the people were exploited in the Russian press to awaken the cupidity of capitalists, who fully realise that the simplicity of Chinese life would make the people easy victims for exploitation. The following is but one of many such accounts, published in the *Videmos*, apropos of a scientific expedition into the Quantung Peninsula:

“Visitors to the Quantung Peninsula cannot fail to notice what great importance is attached to agriculture by the Chinese population. They

¹ So called by the Chinese and Manchus respectively.

² On the model of that at Peking.

till everything which can be tilled. The writer saw walls of fortresses transformed into vegetable gardens; the almost vertical sides of hills were terraced for the sowing of crops. The labourers, who seem never tired, worked from morning till night . . . and not only do the men and youths have to work, but children also. What is it causes the Chinese to work so much when they are naturally lazy? Evidently their destitution—and the Quantung soil is rather barren. . . . It is obvious, therefore, that obstacles to the acquisition of land will be raised; even when a good price is paid for it, the purpose for which it is bought will be misunderstood by the Chinese and viewed with suspicion. To change their mode of life will be contrary to their most sacred interests, and wholly opposed to the Chinese character, which is highly conservative. They will not understand why their natural pursuits should be sacrificed to the alluring idea of getting rich. The acquisition of gold is not a matter for work; and when it is mined, it is done secretly by outcasts that have nothing to lose. The laws forbid the practice of gold-mining, as degrading to morals and injurious to their legitimate pursuits. . . . Therefore, whether gold-mining be established in the Quantung Peninsula by Russian law or not, it will not only meet with the opposition described, but conflict with the Chinese mode of life."

Such is the tribute paid to Chinese integrity and simplicity by a Russian writer. To describe the Chinese as naturally lazy is a calumny, for they are known to be the most persevering and industrious people in the world, and as agriculturists they are infinitely superior to the Russians, and attain a higher degree of material prosperity. As General Ching-Ke-tung observes in his book, *Mon Pays*,¹ the Chinese people know that nothing renews itself, and therefore what is taken from the earth must be restored in due proportion. Even the recognition of this fact shows more sagacity and a higher conception of economy than can be attributed to the Russian moujik.

The decline of prosperity and well-being consequent on the Russian occupation can be gathered from the report of a representative of the Board of Censors, who, at the end of 1897 or in the early part of the following year, was invested with the Imperial authority and despatched to inquire into the conduct of the Government officials in Manchuria. He disbanded his retinue and assumed the disguise of a merchant, the better to accomplish his purposes, and mixing with all classes of the community, prepared a full account of what was transpiring. One village he found entirely deserted, and, on inquiring the cause, learned that the inhabitants had taken to the hills on the approach of the foreign soldiers, who had plundered their homes and issued an order to the effect that if the villagers did not return the houses would be burned to the ground. The people employed on the railway proved to be mostly criminals, reprieved from the torture and other punishments their misdeeds merited according to the law, on condition that they worked out their penalties in gratuitous labour. All wages were paid to a local official, who gave just what he pleased to the unfortunate

¹ Paris, 1892.

people on whom he forced employment, thus reducing them to the condition of slaves. On the least pretext they were flogged and shot by the Cossacks, who, when not guarding the Chinese labourers on the railway, committed outrages and murders daily in their homes.¹ In the meantime, the local officials were engaged in revelry and feasting with the foreigners, lulled to all sense of duty by dreams of illimitable wealth that would result from the exploitation of the resources of the country and the labour of the people in co-operation with Russia. The governors of the districts in the north, having refused Russian bribes, were threatened with diplomatic representations at Peking which would involve their degradation and possibly cost them their lives. The Grand Inquisitor, or Supervisor, found the very heart of Manchuria, the "Heaven-ordained" province (*i.e.*, Feng-T'ien), formerly a model of good government, with prosperous, flourishing guilds and growing industries which supplied all the wants of the people, converted into a nest of iniquity, with treason on the part of officials and atrocities on the part of foreign soldiers, which surpassed any committed by the Ta-Tse bands under Chaio, Tien, Hu, and other robbers, who at this time roamed the neighbouring hills and borders of the Gobi desert.

The supervisor having collected full information concerning the mandarins and subordinate officials who had oppressed the people by forcing them to work on the railway and withholding their wages, caused no less than five to be decapitated in as many days, and many others degraded, while the military commanders who had lost Imperial favour through Russian intrigues were recommended for promotion. Taking all things into consideration, it is not surprising that the Heavenly Brotherhood should extend its influence throughout the length and breadth of the land. Arms and ammunition were imported in large quantities during a considerable period near Kaio Chaio,² and when the source of this supply was discovered, sufficient had been stored away for a long campaign. Contributions were levied on the entire population, and those who refused to pay were carried off and held until ransomed. The outlawed but patriotic clans of the hills round Feng-T'ien made common cause with the Chinese inhabitants who are now in the majority, as did also the Ta-tse of Mongolia. The Grand Council of the society, consisting of some of the principal officials and supported by a prince of the reigning family, entered

¹ I cite but one instance of the crimes perpetrated by these ruffians as an example of the rest. A drunken Cossack presented himself at the hut of a poor labourer, and seizing a woman who appeared at the door demanded *sooli*, an alcoholic beverage. On hearing her cry out, her husband hurried to intervene, and was shot on his own threshold. The Cossack calmly pointed his revolver at the woman and said "Fetch *sooli*." The woman obeyed him and soon afterwards in despair drowned herself in a well into which the Cossack had thrown her husband's body. No punishment was meted out to the offender—blackmail and robbery were everywhere unchecked—the officers giving the utmost license to the men as the only means of preventing insubordination.

² A few miles from Nan-pai.

into relations with the Mahommedans of Central Asia who, nominally under Russian rule, secretly take the oath of allegiance to the Sultan of Turkey annually. But for the lack of arms and ammunition, these would have revolted at the time of the Chinese attack on Blagovestchensk. The Manchus, spread over the empire, were apprised of the nature of the policy followed by the Russophiles; and when the anti-foreign troubles broke out, appeals were made to the patriotic leagues of Shantung and Shansi. It was pointed out to the supporters of the Ming dynasty that the Russian occupation of Manchuria, which was to be the price of Russian neutrality, would be but a preliminary step towards the absorption of Chi-li. Representations were likewise made to the central government; but owing to Russophile intrigues the delegates were handed over to the executioner as members of a dangerous sect.

The plan of campaign was for the clans to rise in Feng-T'ien, and, while the northern army drove the Russians back across the Amur, march on Port Arthur and Talienwan. The failure of the movement was chiefly due to want of co-operation on the part of Government troops, who, drilled by foreign officers, and controlled by pro-Russian officials, had been engaged some time in hunting down the outlawed patriots in the hills round Feng-T'ien.

Generally speaking, the rebellions, both north and south of the Great Wall, were ill-advised and premature. Extensive as were their effects, I must repeat they were but local in character and unsupported by the national sentiment since awakened by the subsequent march of the allies on Peking, and the desecration of the sacred city. But although the anti-Russian movement failed in its main object, it resulted in the breakdown of the Russophile policy; and, what is even more important to China, in the reconciliation of conflicting interests and the converging of the political forces of the empire in support of the national policy. Since it has rendered Russian neutrality impossible and the Manchurian Convention remains unsigned, and since the national policy has forced the central government to modify its relations with Russia, the rising was not wholly in vain.

The military resources of the league remain practically untouched; and the patriotic societies are gaining in power every day, and are spreading beyond the confines of the empire. With the signing of the Manchurian Convention the struggle for independence would begin in earnest.

All things are tending towards a general upheaval, and it would be to the best interests of China, and to those of the Powers interested in her welfare, if it could be avoided. The national movement may lead to a conflict with the allied forces of Europe. This would result in an insurrection of the Russian Mahommedans, possibly in a war between Europe and Asia. But leaving the latter contingency

entirely out of the question, and also the armed resistance of the 400 millions that inhabit the eighteen provinces and dependencies of the Middle Kingdom, and their passive resistance in defeat, a passive resistance that has been known to last for centuries—let us in fact assume that the Powers in mutual accord could subdue China; how many troops would be required to conquer and keep in subjection all these millions in a country the area of which is not less than four and a half-million square miles? And what would be the cost of maintaining an army of occupation?

Surely on reflection such an undertaking is seen to be impossible, even if the Allies could agree among themselves. China knows her power and can wait.

Unless there be a considerable change in the attitude of the Allies and a speedy settlement of the Far Eastern Question, the only alternative to a war with all Europe will be an alliance with one or more of the European Powers against Russia, on terms that will ensure China's integrity. China is fully awake to the necessity for reforms, and is anxious to introduce them, and would welcome an alliance on certain conditions which cannot be said to be exacting or unreasonable. They are respect for Chinese institutions, traditions and prejudices; the maintenance of the empire's territorial integrity—this is a *sine quâ non*—and, to conciliate the trading class and ensure their support, respect for native vested interests to which foreign enterprises constitute a serious danger. These conditions are not incompatible with the professed policy of Great Britain. But for one Chinaman who believes in the desire of certain Powers to maintain the integrity of the empire, there are ten who do not. A liberal spirit towards China in her misfortunes, and an equitable policy, such as is professed by Great Britain, would assuredly, if understood, win the support of the moral and political forces I have endeavoured to describe. Even the most anti-foreign and conservative among the *Literati* would welcome an alliance, on such terms, as the least of two evils, even if it involved a war—which is for China in any case almost unavoidable. But whatever be the issue of the imbroglío, to suppose China, with or without foreign support, will not prove the chief factor in the situation, indicates a singular incapacity on the part of Western nations (with perhaps the exception of Russia) to understand the sleeping forces that underlie the resourceful character of the Chinese.

TAIO-KO (T'IAN-TI-HUWE) AND
CHARLES STANFORD.

THE RURAL EXODUS.

THE agricultural question is one that never leaves us, but lately it has entered on a new phase. This is due to the attention that during the last year has been attracted to the country districts by the sight of the large numbers who have volunteered to the war in South Africa. It has been felt that the men who joined the Yeomanry were the best material from which soldiers could be formed, that the vigorous health and the active out-of-door life of such men, accustomed to deal with horses, and often having some practice in shooting, made them far more fit to endure the hardships of a campaign with its long marches and constant exposure than those who had been bred in towns and whose work had been in close shops could ever be. Consequently the question was asked, can we rely on a constant supply of such men from the country districts, and will there always be a sufficient number ready and able to come forward to carry us through any crisis which may arise? The cry of the Rural Exodus is the answer. The leaders and spokesmen of the agricultural classes have seized the opportunity, and their reply is, "If things in the country go on as they are at present, no. You have been saved by the rural districts this time, but another time it may be impossible; and unless you are ready to help the agricultural labourer now he may not be able to help you when next you require his aid. The countrymen have flocked to your army in this war, but when the next war breaks out there may be no countrymen left to save you."

It has been their opportunity, and they have made the most of it; they have set out in order the hardships of the men who work on the land, they have described at length the heaviness of their lot, and the pooriness of their reward, and contrasted them with those of the workmen in towns, and they have told us of the consequent desertion of the country districts by men, who will no longer be content to work hard and long and receive low wages in return when there are easy hours and good pay awaiting them in the towns. And these are not the only hardships with which the agricultural labourer is asked to put up. His work lasts as long or longer very often than the day itself, he is never free from the idea that at any hour of the twenty-four he may be wanted and called up, and in return for all he does he gets a pittance only as a reward. And yet, we

are told, as if this treatment were not enough, such is the ingratitude shown towards him, and with such slight regard is he looked upon, that very often he is not thought of sufficient value to be provided with a house to shelter him, and he is compelled to leave the land to which he would otherwise stick because he can find no roof to cover his head. And then, though a man may get over the difficulty of finding house room, and be willing to put up for a time with low wages and long hours, yet are we—it is asked—to expect him to be content with this always? Is he to drag on his life without hope of improvement? Is he not, like his town brother, to have some ambition and to be able to look forward to improving his position, so that if he exercise prudence and foresight he may have a reasonable expectation of spending his old age with some degree of comfort?

No one will, we think, deny that this is an important question, or that the complaints put forward by these champions of the country labourer are without foundation. It is important that the agricultural classes should be maintained—every one recognises the services they have done in volunteering for the present war—and no one can be blind to the vast benefits they confer on society by replenishing the stock and improving the breed of the dwellers in large cities. But the difficulty is, how are we to keep a sufficient number on the soil; we do not want to stop the migration or to cause that constant flow of new blood and unimpaired vitality into the towns, which is so necessary to keep up the physical standard, to cease altogether. But without interfering with this it is important that the country districts should not be depopulated, that they should at least keep up their numbers lest the fountain run dry.

That of late years the number has not been maintained is generally admitted; the population of the country districts has decreased to an alarming extent, and there has been a rush on the part of the majority of the young men into the towns. The reasons for this, as generally given, have been already stated to be low wages and excessive hours, want of cottages, and no hope of improvement.

But where is the remedy to be found? No increase in wages under the present conditions of farming can be expected; nor, considering the special conditions of the work, can much alteration be made in the hours of labour. Accordingly, those who are anxious to increase the attractions of the agricultural life have turned their attention to the question of additional cottages and small holdings. These, in their eyes, are the great panacea for the ills of which they complain, and by these the flow of men into the towns is to be arrested; and with these attractions, held out to him, the country labourer is no longer to hanker after the streets of our crowded cities.

But will these proposed remedies answer their purpose? It has

been assumed by nearly every one, without question, that there is a crying need for cottages in the country villages, and that even though a man wishes to stop on the land, he is driven from it because he can find nowhere to live. There may, perhaps, be a slight scarcity of cottages in some few villages; but this complaint is, we believe, greatly exaggerated. That there are fewer now than there were a generation or more back is no doubt true; but the present fewness is not the cause of the migration to the towns, but rather the result of it. Cottage property is not a profitable investment to landlords; they will not build, therefore, and cannot be expected to build more cottages than are actually required for the men who work on the different farms. Before the machinery of to-day came into use there were far more labourers employed on the land than now; house-room was found for these, and there must therefore have been a considerably larger number of cottages at that time than there are at the present. Some of these have no doubt served their time and passed away, but many more have been allowed to fall into disrepair and become uninhabitable because there have been no tenants to live in them. It does not take long for a cottage to get into bad order, and the expense of keeping up an untenanted one is not small. Landlords, therefore, have rather allowed them to go to ruin than throw money away on them which would bring no return. Had there been a want for them, a moderate outlay would have placed many of them in habitable repair and been worth the expense. But there has been no real demand. Were men to return in any numbers to the country, then it would be money well spent to repair the cottages not too far gone, and it might even be necessary to build some additional ones; but to do so now on the chance of this return would be to waste the money which landlords can ill spare. But we are told this cry for more cottages does not come from the agricultural agitators alone. The people themselves are clamouring for them and complaining that they can find no house-room in the villages. It is true, no doubt, that they do make some complaint on this score; but as a rule it is not because no cottage can be found, but because there is none in the exact position which they choose. There is nobody more particular than the labourer of to-day; he wants to have his house in the middle of the village and near the road, so that he may have plenty of society and see and know everything that goes on. His father was content to live near his work and on the farm where his days were spent; it did not matter to him that his house was situated in the middle of fields and at a distance from the main road and village, and that very often there was no neighbour, except at the farm-house, nearer than a mile or two—so long as it was convenient for his work he was content. But ask the present-day labourer to take such a house—very often a far better one than most of those in the

village—with a good garden and close to his work, and in the majority of cases you will get a direct refusal. He would rather live anywhere than there. He is of the prevailing fashion no doubt, and belongs to that class of person who, in town, would far rather live in a pokey house off a fashionable square and with a good address than in a roomier, cheaper, and more comfortable house in some less fashionable neighbourhood. But if you cannot persuade the labourer that it is possible for him to live away from the village, you are not likely to persuade the landlords that they should build new cottages, which will not pay them, in a more central part to suit the tastes of possible tenants. If all the cottages which exist—including the outlying ones—were put in repair and made habitable (and we believe owners as a whole would do this were there a chance of their being occupied), then there would be more than sufficient houses for the country districts. If there is a real dearth in any neighbourhood it is owing to exceptional circumstances and extremely rare; and even if it were less rare than it is, we think that the influence it has on the migration to towns is very slight. The same difficulty we are told is felt in the cities, and to a much larger extent. Men have the greatest difficulty in finding houses near their work, and are often obliged to live a considerable distance away, very much further than any country labourer is asked to go, and yet we do not hear of people being driven from the towns to the country for lack of houses.

It is not, therefore, the question of an extra cottage or two which will stop to any appreciable extent the flocking of men into the towns and act as an attraction to bring wanderers home.

If this, then, is not the remedy, is it to be found in small holdings? Great hopes are laid on these to act as a sedative on the ambitious mind of the countryman and to bind him firmly to his native soil. Give the labourer—it is said—a chance of getting some land for himself; let landowners divide up a part of their estates into small lots so that he may have the opportunity to cultivate a bit for himself and, with this before him, he will not want to go elsewhere. An opening should be made for all classes to satisfy their legitimate ambitions, the country labourer as well as the dweller in a town. And it would, no doubt, be an excellent thing to allow farm hands to have some scope for private enterprise outside their ordinary labour, to give them the chance of earning something in addition to their regular pay and so laying by a little for bad times and old age. The plan of creating small holdings has been already adopted by many landed proprietors, and might well be further developed. But it is doubtful if it will prove such an attraction to the people for whom it is meant as has been expected.

The few men in a country village with some leisure, such as the local shopkeeper, butcher, &c., have welcomed the opportunity of getting some

land. But if a labourer takes a small holding, and these are to vary in size, according to the proprietors of the scheme, from two to forty acres, the work on it will have to be done after his ordinary day is finished, and there are very few who have the energy and enterprise to undertake so much extra labour and to spend the time which would be necessary to work it profitably. As a rule it is as much as a man is able and cares to do, to cultivate his garden and allotment where he grows his potatoes and a bit of corn without saddling himself with the heavy burden of looking after a small holding in his odd hours so as to make it pay. He cannot devote his whole time to it because it would not be possible for him to make a living out of it entirely, he must have his regular employment as well and his holding must be left to his spare time. Suppose, however, that men are energetic enough to do this, to devote their few hours of leisure to work on a small holding; that will not satisfy them always. If they make it pay they will not be content with the few acres they started with, they will want to add to their holding and so by degrees become small farmers, give up their old employment and devote themselves wholly to the cultivation of their own land. This is what we have known from experience to happen, and it is, of course, a most satisfactory result to see a farm-hand work his way up to independence in this manner. But that there ever will be many to follow this example is extremely unlikely, for when we hear of one who succeeds in this way, we almost invariably find that he has had kind friends to give him a help at starting and also has had other members of his family on whom he has been able to rely for work which he never could have undertaken by himself. And there are very few who are so favourably situated as this.

And the question has still to be looked at from the landlord's point of view, for it is by them that the small holdings have to be provided. On the whole they have shown much more readiness to help the country labourer than they have been given credit for, and in many places have done a good deal towards making small holdings on their estates. But the expense of these is no slight one to them; apart from the greater cost and trouble of collecting rents from a larger number of tenants in smaller amounts, these small holdings mean in most cases additional buildings to be erected for each tenant, this requires capital which it is often impossible to lay out, and we doubt whether the State, as suggested, would here come to the assistance of the landlord or whether its aid, if offered, would be acceptable.

But the greatest difficulty is the apportioning of the land to suit the different tenants. To make small holdings, it is necessary at the first start off to get the land, and this can only be done by taking it out of the larger farms. And it is only possible to do this with farmers after a farm has fallen vacant and a tenant left, when it may either be reduced in size and a few acres kept

back to let separately in small holdings, or it may all be divided up; in which latter case the farm-house is probably thrown on the landlord's hands. And the land must be conveniently situated close to the village, for men who have been at work the greater part of the day cannot, on their return home, walk a long way to their holding, and it is impossible to ask or expect them to take land in any of the more outlying parts at a distance from their homes. And when once the first demand for small holdings has been provided for, the difficulty does not stop, because, as we have seen, if a man has made a few acres answer he will gradually want to add to them, and if he is not helped in this, then the whole purpose of small holdings is frustrated. It is possible a man may have saved money and bought some stock, this stock increases, and he must have more land to graze it; and so it comes about, that after a time, and not very long either, the two or three most successful absorb all the conveniently situated land that has been partitioned out and it becomes necessary to begin again the whole process of subdivision.

We have pointed out these difficulties because we believe they have not been sufficiently considered by those, who, without having had much experience of the management of estates, talk somewhat lightly of the making of small holdings, as though nothing were easier than to let men have just what land they wanted. In practice it is most difficult to keep on providing men who have started successfully on a few acres with more as they require it. The amount of land available for the purpose is strictly limited. What there is, is taken readily by those with some leisure such as the local tradespeople and innkeepers who are glad to combine a little farming with their other work, but when they have been supplied, there is not much left for the purely labouring men.

And even if there were more we doubt whether the labourer would be so eager to take it. For experience seems to show that, except in a very few cases, his ambition does not run to the acquiring of land. His ordinary labour is hard and his hours are long. People who come to the country during the best months of the year do not realise the hardships of his life. To be on the land, not only in the fine and warm weather but in the cold and wet as well, requires a tough constitution and involves a trial even on the strongest. He has nominal hours of work, but these have frequently to be disregarded owing to sudden emergencies which arise, and which must be attended to without delay. He has no half-holiday on a Saturday, and Sunday very often does not bring less toil than week days. We have in fact known labourers say that they were more tired at the end of a Sunday than on any other day. They have perhaps lived at some distance from their work; nominally they have had only to go twice on the Sunday to milk the cows and in winter to fodder them, but with the walk twice to and fro from their homes instead of the one

journey on week days they have no more time to themselves than on the other six. A man must have not only a very vigorous constitution, but also a very strong ambition, who will, after his ordinary day's work is over, give up the short time that he has to himself to extra work, even though it is to his own profit. Very few we believe have this ambition, while of those who have it, and get an opening to satisfy it, there are still fewer who possess either the time or the physical strength which are necessary to make the labour on their holiday profitable. Were the country labourer indeed an ambitious person, or did he think very much about the hardships of his lot, then to keep him on the soil, it would be necessary to alleviate the latter and help him satisfy the former, but the alteration in his conditions of work would have to come first. Otherwise it would be only natural that he should welcome the change from work on the soil to that in the town, from the out-of-door life with its exposure to every variation of climate and its long and uncertain hours, with no day of rest, to the covered shop with its protection against rain and cold, its regular hours, the Saturday half-holiday, and the complete freedom of Sunday. And when, in addition to these, there is held out the prospect of better wages then it is expecting a great deal from men that they should still remain on the farm. The last inducement is, we believe, very often a fallacious one—wages in the town are, no doubt, nominally higher, but putting against this the increase in house rent, loss of the profits arising from a garden, fines in the shop, and the greater opportunities for spending money after work hours, it will generally be found that the advantage from the money point of view does not rest with the towns. On the contrary, labourers who have tried both tell us that they have been able to put more by out of the lower wages they received as farm hands than they ever could when working in a town. But even with the wages question put on one side, the other advantages that the town holds out would be quite sufficient to attract any lads and men, discontented with the country. What however has, we believe, done more than anything else to cause the rural exodus and drive men to the towns is not so much the long hours, hard work and want of a field of ambition as the way in which the country is treated by the town. The townsman looks down on the countryman, he adopts towards him, it may be unconsciously, an air of superiority which the latter not unnaturally resents. A lad who has left his village and found employment in a town, returns to his home for a holiday, he may be no better off than when he left, he may not have improved himself or his position at all, but by his manner and talk he will give his old friends to understand that now they are greatly his inferiors, he will leave the impression that he has advanced unmeasurably beyond his late companions and is a much greater person than those whom he condescends to visit.

No one likes to be looked down upon, and the country lad naturally asks what has made all the difference between himself and his friend; he remembers him as no better than himself, but he sees that there is an alteration now; but he is impressed by the airs which the other gives, and, as he listens to his tales, begins to experience the magic attractions which the accounts of the busy town life always have on those who have never taken any part in it. He feels that he is living out of the world, and begins to be ambitious and wants to visit that great place which is described to him as the centre of life. Even though he loves the country and fresh air, and by giving them up gains no great increase in wages, yet he is content to sacrifice these so that he may take his part in the busy activity of life, instead of stagnating and living out of the world, as he is made to feel, he is at home in the country. And there is nothing to disabuse a lad of this idea of the inferiority of country life. The farmers who employ them are looked upon and treated in just the same good-natured and contemptuous way as though they knew nothing of the world and cared only for their crops and sport. We remember only a short time ago a highly intelligent and well-educated farmer making this complaint to us. A friend was staying with him who held a fair position in a big town. As his guest, he tried not to show his great superiority, but felt it his duty to bring down his conversation to what he considered the rustic level and talk about the crops and hunting. He was totally ignorant on these subjects, and in consequence made himself rather somewhat ridiculous by his remarks. The farmer had too much politeness to take any notice of the other's absurdities; but he was an educated man, read his paper daily, and took an intelligent interest in what was going on, and not unnaturally felt a little soreness at the superior tone adopted by his friend from town, who refused to talk on any subject outside what he considered his range of knowledge. And this same assumption of superiority on the part of the town over the country is noticeable in every grade of society. We still hear of country cousins and the dreadful infliction and heavy drag they are found to be with their bucolic habits and ideas. The country squire is still not an altogether exploded creation, and a person who from choice lives in the country and makes only rare excursions to town is considered to be burying himself away from all society and intellectual intercourse, shutting himself out from the world, and wasting all the best gifts with which he has been endowed. The country parson, too, with his large family of impossible daughters, and the smirking curate in attendance at old maids' tea-tables are still, not merely the standing dish for novelists, but, in actual fact, are looked down upon as far inferior to their town brethren by the majority of people.

There is no need to discuss whether these opinions are right, and whether those who live in the country do thereby put themselves on

a lower level than the frequenters of town. But the opinion is undoubtedly prevalent, and so long as it is so, and the town looks down on the country, it will be impossible to keep men from leaving the rural districts. The higher classes have set the example and the lower follow it. From the top to the bottom of the social ladder it is the same—the towns assume a superiority over the country which the latter is not strong enough to resist. In the lower classes, especially among the young, they are quickly influenced by this, and there is nothing to counteract the idea. On the contrary, when a young man is in doubt whether to remain on the land or to go to the city, he sees those above him setting the example of going. People may preach at him as much as they will, and tell him of his folly in giving up his healthy outdoor life for the crowded and unhealthy streets of the city, but when he sees those who tell him this living of their own free will in these same crowded and unhealthy cities, he not unnaturally is unconvinced by their arguments.

This is we believe the main cause of the rush to the towns. Young men are not so much influenced by long hours, hard work, and the small opportunity of getting on that the country affords, as by the desire to what they call better themselves, that is, not necessarily to get higher wages, but to get more into the thick of life. They are told that in the country they are out of the world, slaves to the soil, not human beings but machines, blindly toiling on, a century behind the times, and so they become discontented and are eager to see the world and its activities from within, to take their share in what is going on and to live. This is what they mean by getting on and rising in life. Other inducements have not so very much weight with them: they help to turn the scale, no doubt, between town and country, but the chief influence is the desire to see life.

And if this is so, then the great remedy for the rural exodus is to be found in giving the country labourer a better opinion of himself and his work. Make him feel that by remaining in the country he is not the townsman's inferior. As long as he does feel this inferiority he will always be ambitious to leave the soil for the workshop. Let him know therefore that he is every bit the other's equal, and that he is as important to his country and takes as large a share in the common life whether he lives in the village or the town.

It has been the action of those above him which has persuaded him of the inferiority of the country, and it is only their action which can again persuade him of the contrary. We are not thinking now so much of the great landed proprietors, though their influence is very great, and their presence on their estates has much to do with the prosperity of a village and the numbers of those who remain in it, but rather of that large class of people with moderate incomes who are free to live where they like. On one excuse or another they

almost invariably flock to London, or some other large centre. These have it in their power to do an inestimable service to their country. Let these set an example, and by taking up their residence in some rural neighbourhood show that they believe there is no inferiority attached to it. They can do more in this way to stop the migration to towns than by any amount of theorising on its causes and suggested remedies. The labourer would not be slow to follow their example. He is accustomed to the land, and he will put up with its hardships, if by remaining on it his inferiority is not continually thrust upon him. More residents, too, will mean more work for him, and if he can get sufficient of that and have a contented mind he will not turn restless. He is not really so ambitious or continually on the look out to better himself as we are always being told. What is really wanted for him is to bring back the old love for the country, and to teach him to respect himself and his work. That cannot be done by praising it from a distance. People must come and live on the soil themselves, and so prove that they love it too, and that a man is not debased in doing so. This is the first and most important step, and until this is taken other remedies will fail. By all means do for the labourer what is possible in the way of building cottages, give him small holdings and the opportunity to put by, and if times should improve, increase his wages, for he deserves it, but chiefly let all idea of the town superiority over the country be dropped, and let people show practically to the labourer on the soil that he is the equal in rights and importance with all who work with their hands.

E. A. SELBY LOWNDES.

THE INTOLERABLE SITUATION IN ROME.

THE ever-fresh interest that is taken by English people in the peculiar relations and antagonisms that of necessity exist between the Government of the young kingdom of Italy and the old Papacy must be the excuse for some further remarks on this subject.

A short time ago Pope Leo XIII. described the present situation in Rome as "intolerable," and intolerable it is, alas! one may also add, apparently incapable of improvement. Two classes of writers in England usually deal with the Roman Question in the papers and magazines of the day, the Roman Catholic, who of course take the side of the Papacy and call for the restoration of the temporal power, and the Protestant, who for their part naturally extol the change of Government in Rome, and dwell on the iniquities of Papal rule in the past as compared with the advantages enjoyed by the Romans of to-day. But writing as a Protestant well-wisher of United Italy, and yet, on the other hand, as one acknowledging the grievances of the Vatican, there are certain points that I should like to bring more clearly to the notice of people in England, points that doubtless are known to many, but are well worth repeating.

Pope Leo, whom all Europe respects and admires both as a pope and as a politician, has declared the present situation to be "intolerable"; and surely this is not too strong an epithet to apply to a condition of affairs similar to that in the old fable of the two dogs who met in the middle of a narrow plank over a deep stream? Neither would budge so as to retire for the other, whilst the lack of space prevented a fair fight. The present position of the two Governments in Rome is not unlike that of the two dogs on their plank-bridge; neither Government will budge, yet neither is in an attitude to fight for ultimate supremacy. Now, of these two parties one must retire for the other, and the question is, Which?

The whole of Protestant Europe—and England in particular—considers it is the duty of the Pope to yield; but is this view quite fair and unprejudiced? Has the Papacy neither reason nor excuse for its unyielding attitude towards the Italian Government and the House of Savoy? Though a Protestant and admirer of modern

Italy, I cannot help thinking that the Papal party has some good and valid arguments for preserving its present policy.

In the first place, there still exists the deep and only natural resentment, helpless no doubt, of the weak robbed by the strong; and this deprivation took place only some thirty years ago. LEO XIII., even when more than a middle-aged man, has known Rome as a papal city, and yet we are told that it is wrong and childish for him to cling to the dream of the temporal power! We see nothing foolish and unnatural in the desires and hopes of the French for the recovery of Alsace and Lorraine, lost to France almost contemporaneously with the seizure of Rome by the Italians, though these provinces were only added piecemeal to modern France in the seventeenth century: but of course for the Papal party—and it is a party—to dare to hope for the recovery of Rome, which the Popes have ruled for so many centuries, with scarcely an interruption, and which was theirs but yesterday, is in the last degree absurd and even culpable! This may be put down of course as a purely sentimental reason for the refusal of the Papacy to “work” with the present Government of Italy, but is such sentiment to be utterly ignored in this case? Is it not rather a reason for treating the aggrieved party all the more delicately, carefully, and generously? But this is exactly what the Italian Government has refused to do in the case of the city of Rome. The feelings of the Pope and the clerical party with regard to the city which has been theirs for so many hundreds of years have been harrowed without stint, so much so that we may fairly conclude it has been the special object and desire of the present *régime* to humiliate and annoy the Vatican in every possible way. Churches have been torn down on the flimsiest of excuses; papal scutcheons, often of fine workmanship and great historical interest, have been purposely destroyed or defaced; a statue of Giordano Bruno has been erected in the Campo de’ Fiori, with an insulting inscription on its pedestal for all the country folks from the Campagna and the Hills to read;¹ but of course in the eyes of Protestant Europe all these are trifles, mere pin pricks of the ruling powers in Rome to vex the overthrown priesthood, and therefore quite fair and excusable.

If my first plea for the correctness of the attitude of the Vatican in the present situation be one of sentiment, my second is of a very practical nature. This is the enormous loss to the papal treasury owing to its deprivation of Rome and the old States of the Church, as they existed in their diminished borders in 1870; for, for over

¹ Only this spring, 1901, the clerical party in Rome has again been much scandalised and annoyed by the unnecessary erection at great expense of four nude female statues on the base of the beautiful Termini Fountain, opposite Santa Maria degli Angeli. The writer, who has recently seen these brazen nymphs, can himself testify that the clerical protest is fully justified both on the grounds of public decency and of good taste.

thirty years nothing has accrued to the Vatican from its former territory. This argument will, of course, be met by the inevitable answer, "But the Italian Government has promised to set aside every year the large sum of £120,000 for the Pope, as compensation for his loss of the temporal power!" This would be a good answer had a treaty ever been signed between the King of Italy and the Pontiff, by which the latter had transferred his sovereign rights over Rome for such a sum. But no such treaty exists: it has been simply a case of occupation of a desired property by violence, followed by an offer of compensation to the disturbed original owner. It may seem strange to English people that the Pope refuses to accept and acquiesce in this arrangement, by renouncing for himself and his successors kingly rights that have been exercised for many hundreds of years by the Roman pontiffs, in return for a certain specified income; but it must be borne in mind that the Pope was never consulted, and that the "treaty" of 1871 is merely an act of grace of the Italian Parliament, never ratified or ever acknowledged by the most interested party, the Papacy. In one sense, therefore, there are no relations at present existing between the two Governments; it is a curious case of *laissez faire* of the most awkward nature. An inadequate offer has been held out by one party to the other, which for more than thirty years has silently and contemptuously refused it; yet all this while the Vatican has been deprived of a vast revenue, to which, whether as the fruits of sovereignty or as compensation for the loss of that sovereignty, it is justly entitled in the opinion of all. Can we wonder, then, at the present deadlock?

But why does the Papacy refuse to take up this offer of compensation from the ruling powers of Rome and Italy, since half a loaf is better than no bread when the choice lies between the half or none? The Pope may sullenly hold out for ever against the arrangements made for him by the Italian King and Parliament in 1871, but he is only hurting himself and the papal exchequer by so persisting; nor is the Italian Government to blame, since it recognises the old papal rights over Rome and professes itself willing to pay a handsome *solatium* yearly for these rights; then what is the use or object of this stubborn, passive resistance, which deprives Italy of peace and the Vatican of its necessary and proper income? The answer is a simple one and goes straight to the root, to the *origo mali*, of the present political situation in Rome. The Vatican can never again agree to a convention with Italian King and Parliament alone; it cannot trust itself to any agreement with one Power that so frequently in the past has shown itself capricious and untrustworthy in its dealings. A mere whim of the personal ruler of Italy, or a transient wave of anti-clerical feeling in the Chamber, may bring about the revocation of this "treaty" between the old

power and the new at any moment, and propose in its stead a fresh arrangement between the helpless pontiff and the all-powerful military force by which his little island of territory in Trastevere is surrounded. The papal policy of foregoing the uncertain advantages offered and of continually protesting is wiser and more dignified than a policy of surrender, followed by a possible disavowal and change of existing treaties. Nor is the Pope's attitude of protest and self-denial without its effect among the nations of Europe, who must see why it is that the Vatican refuses to treat with a Power that has repeatedly broken its most solemn promises to the Holy See in the past, notably by the invasion of papal territory before the battle of Mentana in 1867 and by the capture of Rome, practically defenceless, on September 20, 1870. By studying the course of Central Italian politics between 1848 and 1870 it will readily be seen that the promises of the House of Savoy and the Italian Government made to the Papacy were about as valuable and trustworthy as those of our own King Charles I. to his Parliament "on the word of a king." The extraterritoriality of the palaces of the Vatican and Lateran and the papal villa of Castel Gandolfo, together with the large annual sum voted as compensation to the Pope for his "commandeered"—hateful word, now engrafted into our language!—kingdom, may seem a fair and handsome arrangement to my readers, but—is the offer genuine? Is it to be broken when convenient, like the former promises of the self-made Government? We English grew tired at last of our Charles I.'s oaths on the word of a king, and for the same reason, mistrust owing to long experience, the Vatican now looks askance at the Italian Parliament's one-sided and rough-and-ready settlement of perhaps the most delicate and difficult political problem of our age. Whether or no the Vatican ever would consent to some such arrangement as the King and Parliament of Italy profess to offer is, of course, open to doubt; but one thing is certain, and that is that it will never consent to any permanent settlement based merely on the vote of the Chamber at Monte Citorio and on the word of the King of Italy. And who can deny but that past experience does not justify this *non possumus* attitude of the Papal Curia?

But perhaps even more repugnant to the Pope than the actual possession of Rome and the present *modus vivendi* (which he ignores) is the extraordinary fact that at this very moment the King of Italy is domiciled at the Quirinal, the favourite private palace of the Popes in Rome! This surely was at the time an inexcusable act of violence and bad taste on the part of the incoming sovereign, and quite unnecessary into the bargain. Were there not many vast palaces in Rome in 1870 that could have been bought for the occupation of the Sardinian Court? Cannot the people of Rome to-day, whose municipality is squandering tens of millions of lire on a

useless monument to Victor Emmanuel I. on the Capitol, a true *abîme de dépenses* in an impoverished city, build a new palace for the sovereigns of their own choice, whose coming they heralded with such joy? "You cannot treat with a robber who is still living in another man's house!" is the contemptuous answer of the clerical party to the question why the Papacy is so adverse to any attempt at reconciliation, or even arrangement, with the present ruling house in Italy; and we can but admit that there is a scintilla of reason and truth in the reply.

On the other hand, it is said—and none will deny it—that the spiritual power and prestige of the Papacy have increased enormously since the loss of the temporal power in 1870; that the possession of Rome was an incubus attached to the Holy See, a moral mill-stone round the neck of the Vicar of Christ on Earth, which hindered and prevented the best schemes of the Papacy; that, instead of attending to its world-wide duties, to its great task of ruling and caring for its numberless adherents in all parts of the globe, the time, money, and energy of the Vatican were usually consumed in futile and sometimes not very creditable efforts for the maintenance of the sovereignty in Rome. Now that this stumbling-block has been removed and the Roman Church is free, what more can she require or demand?

What, indeed, *does* the Roman Church want? We do not know, and it is useless here to speculate as to what might, or what might not, ultimately satisfy the Pope and the Papal Curia: but we may assume that the first thing required to open the way to a friendly and final arrangement between the two Governments in Rome is a true guarantee—not by the Italian Parliament and King alone, but by all the nations that at present have envoys accredited to the Vatican—that the independence of the Pope shall always be respected, so that, no matter what political changes may occur in Italy, or even in Rome itself, the head of the Roman Church shall for ever be permitted to continue in peace his great duties towards all of the Roman faith throughout the world. The great power of the Pope for good or evil is not an Italian possession alone, and it would be an unfortunate and most dangerous state of affairs should he, with his universal and peculiar influence over so many millions of mankind, ever become a puppet or a prisoner in the hands of the rulers of Italy, whosoever they may be, as the Popes of the fourteenth century became the tools of the French kings at Avignon.

It is as much to guard against the possibility of this danger, as on the actual merits of the case itself, that I should rejoice to see all the nations of Europe and America, Protestant as well as Catholic—for all Protestant nations have Catholic citizens, and are therefore more or less interested in the fate of the Papacy—combine

together, and solemnly agree to maintain the inviolability of the Pope, especially with regard to the changes and chances of modern Italian politics, since the chief causes of this present condition of things in Rome, as I have already pointed out, are the untrustworthiness of the Italian Government and its scarcely-veiled hostility to the Vatican, which, though quite defenceless, and possessing neither troops nor guarantee for its defence against encroachment, yet prefers not to run further risk by again trusting to the promises of so capricious and (apparently) unfriendly a neighbour.

The well-wishers of Italy have every reason to expect great things of the young King Victor Emmanuel II, and we can only hope that in his undoubted desire to serve his country he may set himself to work to do all in his power to conciliate that *imperium in imperio* which, it must be confessed, both his father and grandfather before him have treated with marked unfairness. But, do what he will, Victor Emmanuel II. cannot of himself accomplish this end that is so desirable for modern Italy. The pride of the Popes has been deeply wounded, and, doubtless, at present the Vatican would hold itself aloof from any attempt, however well meant, at reconciliation from its old enemy, that enemy that has risen from the rule of a petty State to the sovereignty of all Italy. The greatest caution and ceaseless tact are required in the first place. But this is not all. The king must look beyond the bounds of Italy to effect a lasting compromise, for the present political parties in Italy itself, under whatever name they hold office, all persist in annoying and humiliating the Papacy. He must appeal, as I said before, to the other Christian Powers of the world, who all have an interest in the affairs of the Pope and consequently an interest in his relations with the Power in whose territory he is situated. Whether such an appeal fail or succeed, it is at least worth the trying, and every honest attempt at promoting peace, however unsuccessful, must tend to help the situation.

The present condition of affairs in Rome is indeed intolerable, and its full solution on paper is far beyond the scope of this short article; but I have endeavoured to point out some facts and to make one suggestion that may possibly be of service to those in England who desire to study this important and really international question without prejudice.

H. M. VAUGHAN.

MARRIAGE AND MORALITY

BUT are not marriage and morality united by one and the same tie? Are they not wedded together in bonds as indissoluble as church, priest, and sacrament can render them? Does not a woman through their united strength attain to a certain dignity of place, even to such a splendour of virtue, that she is able henceforward to shine as a bright light in a naughty world? And the man, however grievous his course may have been made in the past, however grievous the backslidings of his youth, though his repentance be of that ungodly sort which lasteth not, and his sorrow be as transitory as the delicate tracery of the hoar frost, is he not too purged of all his sins, all the black record of his past wiped out by this one supreme act of atonement and justification?

However perplexing to the philosophical mind may be this problem, however unsatisfying the verdict of the world, its decree has, for long centuries, gone forth, and like the august proclamation of a Cæsar is obeyed without question—that marriage is perforce joined to morality—that, whatever the conditions with which this solemn league and covenant are sealed, it is right, fitting, and moral, and that henceforward neither the man nor the woman has anything to fear—they are of the elect, and so pre-destined to salvation. But what of the verdict which is given, not by the world but by the still, small voice of solitude and reflection? Is it true that a marriage is sacred, or even binding, because the world happens to approve and to wag its head in an ecstasy of righteous fervour? What are the conditions, apart from the world's voice, which makes marriage a sacrament? What are the conditions which make it but a vile prostitution of human beings, who thus, with careless and criminal prodigality, squander their heritage? Before I attempt to answer this question I should perhaps explain it is solely of the upper and middle classes that I am speaking—the lower classes so-called err in an entirely different way, of which it is not my present intention to speak—but the cultivated classes sin far more grievously in an opposite direction, and their sordid and ignoble calculation—so much money, so exalted a rank, equal to so much beauty or so much youth—is a graver sin against morality than are the hasty and consequently ill-assorted marriages of the poor—graver, because they represent the class from which should spring

the best men and women, the future rulers of our state, the strength of our empire—graver, because through education their instincts should be purer, their desires more ardent and of greater strength, at once more passionate and more controlled.

With regard to this question Nature, I think, teaches us a great lesson. She teaches us that one of the strongest instincts man possesses, his desire to propagate his kind, is not implanted in us for the mere gratification of a passing desire, it is indeed for a great and noble object, no less an end than the harmonious and complete development of the species through the survival of the fittest, though this may be at the sacrifice of the welfare of the individual. We may call this instinct what we will—love, passion, sexual impulse, irresistible attraction—it is all one and the same thing; but we must obey it in its integrity and purity, or we must forfeit our place in the great scheme of Nature's development. We may clothe its form with radiant beauty, we may encircle its brow with a halo of glory, but it is, though under the ideal covering we recognise it not, the summons of Nature to take our part in the progress of nations.

Let me not be misunderstood. This constraining power of love which makes either a man or woman long with infinite passion for one particular person of the opposite sex, and to be satisfied with no other, is no beautiful mysticism, it is an actual truth. On this matter poets have probed deeper into the heart of humanity than have great men of science or hoary-headed philosophers; they, through the purest source of knowledge—intuition—have realised that love is the strongest, the most original, the most universal force we possess. We may disregard its voice, or we may turn our back on its beacon-light, but if we refuse to listen or to be guided, it is at our own risk we do so, and not at our own risk alone, but at the risk and at the peril of unborn generations. For this reason this instinct has as its great end the welfare of the species, and its intensity is in proportion to its power of individualisation. The strong attraction which at first draws a particular man and woman towards each other, developing as their natures mingle into a deep and absorbing passion, shows that he and she are perfectly adapted to each other, that their mental and moral qualities and their physical characteristics are not so much in accord as in harmonious complement to each other, and thus the child or children produced by these two will be completely developed human beings. Nor will such passion be transitory, it has its origin in Nature, its root, its culture, in the spiritual identity which, amid superficial differences, unites these two, and it is only through these spontaneous methods that the best men marry the noblest women. Therefore, I repeat, a marriage cannot be moral, sacred, or even binding, if this great original instinct be perverted from its purity, if other questions are

allowed to affect the issue. If position, place, title, fortune—if any one of these add but a pennyweight to our decision, we cease to possess our humanity, we are prostituting our bodies, corrupting our souls; we are, so far as progress is concerned, at a standstill, or, rather, we are retrograding, and we are carrying with us—think of it, you careless women of fashion—the children that should be the bulwark of our empire, and the foundation of our national well-being.

And so that marriage should promote, rather than be inimical to the welfare of the future generations, and so that it should assume its sacred character, each child, so soon as it arrives at adolescence, should be taught the awful responsibility that rests on each member of the Commonwealth; and that the mind of each child may be in a healthy condition it should receive, whether it be a boy or girl, the same thorough education, physical and mental, begun at home in its most impressionable years, continued, with due regard to individuality, at school and college. And, further, considering how great are the inherited disadvantages of our daughters, how artificial their nature has become through centuries of unnatural forcing and neglect, considering how supreme should be their influence in the nursery, how powerful the effect upon their children of their intellectual force, we must give them not less but even more attention than we now give to their brothers, we must accord to them, not with less generosity but with greater, a thorough training and education.

But so long as present conditions exist, and so long as women are trained from their earliest childhood to be artificial instead of natural, to loiter out their existence instead of labouring in the vineyard of life; so long as marriage is looked upon as a woman's inevitable destiny, as a means of maintenance and as a prop to keep her at all times from falling; so long as she heeds nothing of the welfare of the race, nor listens to the promptings of her own heart, nor concerns herself with the purity of her own intuitions, so long will marriage and morality be divorced, and the consequence, the lowering of the standard of the race, inevitable. When men and women can forget their worldly prudence, when they can listen to the voice of Nature, although their marriage may be, and often is, a failure so far as their own happiness is concerned, seeing how rare is the union of passionate love with spiritual identity, they may console themselves with the reflection that they have done their best, inasmuch as they have not thwarted Nature in her great scheme.

AGNES G. LEWIS.

STEPHEN PHILLIPS.

AT a time when so much of the literary output is ephemeral and worthless, when feeble operas and dramas of questionable merit hold the boards it is a keen pleasure to examine for a brief space work of high literary promise and achievement, to read poetry which has some pretension to the name, to see a play which demonstrates some of the excellences to be found in the productions of Shakespeare and his contemporaries. With *Herod* Mr. Stephen Phillips reasserted his position as a dramatist from whom we are justified in expecting very great things. Seldom has it fallen to the lot of any sower in the field of literature to reap fame in so short a time—to produce in a few years works which, taken as a whole, merit the very liberal meed of praise which the greatest judges of the literary art have accorded them. It is proposed, therefore, to pass these works in review as briefly as possible, and to trace, in as clear a manner as may be, the tendencies to be seen in them.

Mr. Phillips' first published poems were contributed to a booklet entitled *Primævia*, which was issued in conjunction with three other authors, one of whom was his cousin, Mr. Laurence Binyon, a poet who is rapidly becoming widely recognised. Among our author's contributions to this volume there is no poem that deserves distinction, although many of the seeds which have since borne such good fruit can be readily detected. *Eremus*, published in 1894, may be regarded as his first serious effort and the only one which has not received wide encomium. It was commended by a few men of such calibre as John Addington Symonds and Mr. Stopford Brooke—an appreciation limited but valuable. It is the life-story of a dying hermit, related on a mountain-top to two friends who have borne him thither. The form of the poem is not attractive. It is somewhat long and is written in blank verse—a medium needing a sonorous diction, a uniformly excellent style, and strong, well-sustained human feeling to make a lengthy poem effective. These qualities, while not entirely lacking, for there are many felicitous touches and some dignified passages, are not sufficiently in evidence. This poem the author has recently withdrawn.

He next gave us *Christ in Hades, and Other Poems*. The title-poem, the longest and most important, exhibits the pregnant qualities of *Eremus* in a more developed form. It has the advantage of

being shorter, its construction is distinctly better, and the blank verse is handled with more adroitness. It has, too, that intensity of human interest which *Eremus* lacked. As an art subject the Descent was well exploited by the Old Masters—Mantegna, Sodoma, Tintoretto, and Dürer, to mention only four, attempted it—but we do not know that it has been essayed before in poetry. Mr. Phillips therefore wended his way over what was practically new ground, which presented unwonted difficulties. The marvel is that he has done so well. Christ descends into the Greek Hades with all the freshness of spring clinging to Him. Here He meets Persephone, the queen of those “tormented phantoms, ancient injured shades,” who tells Him of their ineffable yearnings for the sun, the rain, and all the “cold odour” of earth. “Now,” she says,

“It is the time of tender, opening things.
Above my head the fields murmur and wave,
And breezes are just moving the clear heat.
O the mid-noon is trampling on the corn.
On cattle calm, and trees in perfect sleep.”

The poet's love of nature inherent in these and other lines, the earnest expression of human longing in a poem of dreamy incoherency, the contrast between the brightness and “the greenness” of earth and “the dimness” and the phantasmal horror of Hades (suggested rather than described), and the simple language, have an effect on the reader which is not easily forgotten. The very presence of Christ releases the spirits; they “drift and glide” towards Him, and

“like to trees
Motionless in an ecstasy of rain,
So the tall dead stood drooping around Christ”

—a simile too beautiful and too vivid to be passed without quotation. They are agonised by the fervent hopes they feel when He places Himself at their head to lead them whither they aspire. But Virgil stands in His path, afflicted with the “human trouble,” and says:

“I fear for thee: around thee is the scent
Of over-beautiful, quick-fading things,
The pang, the gap, the briefness, all the dew,
Tremble, and suddenness of earth.”

The last two lines, although somewhat ambiguous in mere verbal expression, are impregnated with the very spirit of human existence. Christ lingers, and the spirit multitude behind chafe and murmur at His hesitancy. Prometheus, the only shade who is unreleased by His presence, calls on Him to stay, saying that even He cannot release him from his crag. “Thy hands are too like mine to undo these bonds.” Christ is told that He shall know

trouble so exquisite that Ixion shall weep for Him, and that He shall even envy Prometheus his "shadowy crag"—that trouble caused by the effect of His words on the world. Prometheus has already felt it; nothing that ever shall befall is new to him:

"Already I have suffered it far-off;
And on the mind the poor event appears
The pale reflection of some ancient pang."

Christ moves to unbind the fettered Titan, but is stopped by a vision of the world's misconception of the spirit of His word. "The human history before His eyes defiles," "an endless host parading past" Him they call their Master, but He

" . . . had no joy in them, although aloud
They cried his name, and with fierce faces glad
Looked up to him for praise, all murmuring proud."

The Shades remain hovering round Him, urging Him on to the accomplishment of their deliverance. Then, seeing that He stirs not, they wander off "to despair," and Hades her interrupted life resumes.

Mr. Phillips calls the poem a phantasy, and this is exactly what it is. It would seem as though all that he describes had passed before him in a dream: the utterances are dreamlike, "the shades of night" flit through the whole poem. The central figure is a dream figure, not clearly outlined. He has not been given the illuminative effect of speech. But the poem conveys the unexpressed idea that Christ is a dreamer who has dreamed of the result of the sacrifice on the cross—an idea germinated in the mind probably by the poet's vivid realisation of the transcendent difficulty of achieving this result, and to his keen consciousness of the difference between Christianity as conceived by the world and as promulgated by Christ. Judged simply as poetry, the poem is worthy of high praise: this is made manifest by the excerpts given above. No one can doubt the superior imaginative powers of the poet, although he has exercised a restraint which, considering the nature of the subject, is remarkable.

His volume of *Poems* was published in 1897. It was crowned by the Academy as the best work of the year with the first prize of one hundred guineas: the year when Mr. Henley's brilliant essay on Burns took second. The most important of its contents is undoubtedly *Marpessa*. Of this poem, Mr. William Watson said, "He [Mr. Phillips] has demonstrated what I should hardly have thought demonstrable—that another poem can be finer than *Christ in Hades*." And, indeed, one cannot help regarding *Marpessa* as the finest of Mr. Phillips' published works—better even than *Paolo and Francesca* or *Herod*, although the latter, because of the dearth of good poetical

drama at the present time, is entitled to greater esteem. But if intellectual pleasure really be the aim and end of good poetry, it is hardly possible to conceive better than that given us by Mr Phillips in this poem, for the pleasure it affords is beyond expression. The vivid imagination of the poet has put into the lips of Apollo an irresistibly alluring description of the life in the hyperborean realms, quotation of any part of which lack of space, unfortunately, forbids. And what can equal the passionate reply of Marpessa to the pleadings of Apollo and Idas? What can excel in humanheartedness the following lines?

“ ‘ But if I live with Idas, then we two
On the low earth shall prosper hand in hand
In odours of the open field, and live
In peaceful noises of the farm, and watch
The pastoral fields burned by the setting sun
And he shall give me passionate children, not
Some radiant god that will despise me quite,
But clambering limbs and little hearts that cry ’

Few poets have more ably transmitted the essence and spirit of life than Mr Phillips in this stirring passage. The other poems contained in this volume may be passed over.

“ *Paolo and Francesca* ” was his next publication, and it appeared in 1899. Few poets would have attempted *Christ in Hades* without trepidation; Mr. Phillips was even more daring when he ventured to touch one of the finest gems in Dante’s great work. In his hands what the Italian tells in a few lines has been expanded to a drama of four acts. The curtain rises on the marriage of Giovanni and the youthful Francesca, who, “ scarce yet awake upon the world,” comes from a convent. She is brought to Rimini by Paolo, who has conceived a great love for his brother’s bride, insomuch that he desires, now that his duty to Giovanni is accomplished, to fly from the castle. Francesca pleads with him not to go, Giovanni does likewise. The lame explanations which Paolo gives his brother for thus wishing to depart so suddenly first create unrest in the husband’s mind. The foreboding of Lucrezia, Giovanni’s cousin, converts this unrest into poignant apprehension. She tells him to beware of Francesca, to dread her first ecstasy, if some one “ wonderful as a prince from fairyland ” should appear to her. “ Youth goes towards youth,” she says, and the words haunt Giovanni. His dark brooding is intensified when his old nurse, Angela, to whose blind eyes the future has been revealed, divulges her prescience. Act II opens with the impatience of Paolo to begone. Giovanni, full of the peril of Francesca, begs him once more to stay. He would be easier, he says, if when absent on affairs Paolo were by her side. Francesca also for the second time urges him to remain. This scene

between her and Paolo is one of the most beautiful passages in the play.

PAOLO: Francesca, think not I can lightly leave you
And go out from your face into the dark.
Ah! can you think it is not sweet to breathe
That delicate air and flowery sigh of you,
The stealing May and mystery of your spirit?
Am I not flesh and blood?—am I not young?
Is it easy, then, for youth to run from youth?—
And yet from you I run. Or are we swift
To fly delight?—And yet from you I fly.
What shall I say?

FRANC.: Sweet are your words, but dark.
Is beauty to be dreaded, then, and shunned?

PAOLO: How shall I tell you and sow in you thoughts
Which are not there as yet? [He moves to go.

FRANC.: And you will go?
Will you not say farewell? Will you not kiss
My hand at least? Why do you tremble, then?
Is even the touch of me so full of peril?

PAOLO: O! of immortal peril."

Then Lucrezia, after hearing from Giovanni of Angela's revelation of "the peril," first instils into his mind suspicion of Paolo. Paolo leaves Rimini, but turns back while still within sight of the castle: he must see Francesca and die. In Act III, the curtain rises on the interior of the drug shop of Pulci. Hither Giovanni comes for a potion to enthrall for him the love of Francesca. Hither also repairs Paolo for a poison to end his misery. Giovanni, in hiding, overhears what passes between Paolo and the druggseller; and an unwilling suspicion now becomes certitude. Hence Paolo proceeds to what he believes to be his last interview with his brother's wife. He finds her in the arbour of the castle garden, reading of Launcelot and Guenevere.

"Noi leggeramo un giorno per diletto
Di Lancillotto."

They kiss and that day read no more. In this scene Mr. Phillips has admirably translated the tense emotion of Dante's lines. Act IV. reveals the plot of Giovanni and Lucrezia to entrap the lovers, the savage retribution of the wronged husband, and the calm and peaceful end: "Hide them. They look like children fast asleep."

In *Paolo and Francesca* Mr. Phillips has, to quote his own words,

"Borrowed as beautifully as the moon
The fire of the sun"

—borrowed, that is, the sentiment, saturated himself with the intense human feeling of the story, and realised the principal characters so that they live. All this, however, could have been done in a short poem: the result, indeed, would have been better

than that achieved by a play which is, to tell the truth, somewhat ineffective—ineffective because so obviously padded. For instance, there is little vital to the play in the whole of Scene 2 of Act II. The light dialogue there serves, no doubt, as a *divertissement* after the strong scene between Lucrezia and Giovanni, but if designed with this end in view, the device is very artificial. Whoever reads the play a second time—and any one who loves good poetry *must* do so—will very probably skip all that between pp. 52 and 58. The same remark applies to a part of Scene 1, Act III. On the other hand, more might have been made of Nita and Bernardo: a second thread of action, involving these characters, could—the assertion is not made without diffidence—have been devised to relieve the tension set up by the tragic action; and being an action by itself would not have appeared superfluous. The minor characters are not successfully realised: none of them makes the slightest impression on either hearer or reader. The dialogue throughout is idyllic, like the verse of Marpessa: a medium which is well suited to that subject, not so to *Paolo and Francesca*, which is delightful in the pastoral *As You Like It*, but somewhat incongruous in a tragedy like *Othello*. It follows, therefore, that Mr. Phillips has been most successful in the love scenes. He reads the souls of these lovers for us, as he reads those of Marpessa and Idas; they become real and tremulous with life and love, consumed with the fire of an overmastering passion, and sinning unwillingly, because they are young, because youth goes towards youth. At the time when he wrote this play he might have made a passable rendering of the balcony scene in *Romeo and Juliet*, but the tragic intensity of the final scene would have been utterly beyond his powers.

In some points, nevertheless, this play promises well. We are made to feel strongly the bitter irony of the course of events, the sheer inevitableness of the end; and irony is a dramatic implement of great power. Both Francesca and Giovanni twice plead with Paolo to stay at the castle; thus unconsciously playing into the hands of fate. And just before the tragic consummation both Giovanni and Lucrezia commend Francesca to Paolo, intentionally striving to bring them together.

"FRANC.:

O, why so eager?

Where would all those about me drive me? First

My husband earnestly to Paolo

Commends me; and now you must call him in."

The simple nature of Giovanni has been well portrayed. He is a man of affairs, a warrior; he is trustful, has not indeed the faintest trace of suspiciousness in his whole fibre. Lucrezia is in direct contrast. A barren woman, involved in no special activities, constantly brooding over her empty and unsatisfactory existence, her

mind is warped, and she is distrustful of every one. She first cautions Giovanni to watch the pureness of Francesca. She works on him until she destroys his happiness: then feels a bitter joy at its destruction. "Thou wast so rich—now thou art poor as I." And it is she who suggests to him the plan to catch the lovers, unawares. Her character is complex: sometimes one phase is hardly reconcilable with another. We feel, indeed, that it is the poet who, in one or two beautiful lines, forewarns us of Francesca's first ecstasy, although the words are put in the mouth of Lucrezia; but it is she, the cynical and morose woman, who, in a line immediately following, bids Giovanni not to stride about the room—"your limp is evident the more." Again, prescient of the danger as she was from the first, and knowing, moreover, the *cause* of the danger—"youth goes towards youth"—she betrays traits of a sympathy sufficiently acute to probe the matter to the heart. Her actions belie this sympathy: the soul which pierces to the core acts as though only the outer skin had been seen. The sudden revulsion of feeling after Francesca has questioned "you have no children?" indicates no fundamental unity in her character—it is too sudden and too unconvincing. And her lamentation over her barrenness, a moving and splendid passage in itself, is not only an unfortunate digression, but, as part of the play, lacking in cogency. She has been called a minor character: even so, no excuse is necessary for dealing with her at such a length as in this paper, because on her more than on any other character the slight plot hinges, and she is the poet's first attempt at intricate characterisation.

The publication of *Herod* marks a distinct advance alike in poetic and dramatic art. Here is the plot in brief. Herod, chief of the usurping Idumean house, has married Mariamne of the Asmonean line, whose pride of race engenders bitter hatred in the hearts of Cypros and Salome, the king's mother and sister. At Mariamne's desire, Herod appoints her beloved brother, Aristobulus, to the high priesthood. But the growing favour of the latter with the people induces Herod to command his secret murder. By this crime he loses the love and gains the hatred of Mariamne; and so far from removing the danger increases it, inasmuch as her daily visits to her brother's tomb stir up the people to mutiny. An intrigue of Cypros leads Herod to believe that Mariamne has attempted to poison him, but even then he is not provoked to slay her. It is only when driven to frenzy by his mother's suggestion that the woman he has loved so well has been unfaithful with his guard Solemus that he does this.

The mainspring of the play is the intense love which Herod and Mariamne bear for each other. A second action is the latter's love for Aristobulus. The sisterly affection for one who is in high favour with the populace obviously cannot but cause trouble between the king and queen. Another action is the intrigue of Cypros and

Salome to disgrace and kill Mariamne. As a setting there is the war between Mark Antony and Octavius, and the looming power of Rome—a background, let it be said, which throws the principal incidents of the play into strong relief by the ironic light it casts on them. For when Herod returns from his visit to Octavius, bearing glad tidings, he is met by an outraged queen who knows him to be her brother's murderer.

"HEROD: And what this victory but to pour it
Into your ears! I had imagined all
Meetings but this--this only I foresaw not."

When, immediately after ordering Mariamne's death, he repents and would countermand it, the arrival of envoys from Rome announcing other successes interrupts him, and the queen is slain. And again, while rigid in catalepsy at the sight of his dead Mariamne, more good news comes.

In Herod we have a most complex character. He is an Oriental potentate surrounded by all the luxury, pomp and magnificence of the barbaric East: he is a western monarch, civilised and refined, a wily diplomat in close touch with Rome and the affairs of the West. He is a monster ever ready to "trample, crush, corrupt, and kill," the murderer of the assembled Sanhedrin, yet capable of a passionate and enduring love. He is superstitious and fearful of what he fails to understand:

"I hear a whispering of some new king,
A child that is to sit where I am sitting;
* * * * *
And he shall charm and soothe, and breathe and bless,
The roaring of war shall cease upon the air,
Falling of tears and all the voices of sorrow.
And he shall take the terror from the grave—
* * * * *
A gentle sovereign. Ah, might there not be
Some power in gentleness we dream not of?"—

but he will meet Octavius face to face, however dangerous that course may be—

"Great difficulties bring delight to me"

—and he will confront a frenzied mob with dauntless courage. He is a practical man of affairs, yet a dreamer. All these diverse phases of his character are reconcilable, and, except in one instance, Mr. Phillips has in a few words convincingly indicated them. The one passage to which we demur is:

"And he shall still that old sob of the sea,
And heal the unhappy fancies of the wind,
And turn the moon from all that hopeless quest;
Trees without care shall blossom, and all the fields
Shall without labour unto harvest come."

This is the author of *Marpessa* and not Herod speaking. Only one other distinct trace of the poet's mind is to be found in this play, and that is the foolish interlude in the middle of Act I. where Bathsheba and other women utter a page or more of poetical phrases about the heat, the breezes and the like. Digression is the fatal weakness of *Paolo and Francesca*; it is but a minor defect in *Herod*; and from these facts, if from nothing else, Mr. Phillips' advance in his art can be judged. Another evidence of greater power is the better realisation of the minor characters. The cynical Gadias, the simple and trusty Gaul, Sohemus, the cruel and crafty intriguers, Cypros and Salome, the weak and boyishly arrogant Aristobulus—all are really living, breathing personages. The play has more effectiveness, more dramatic concentration. The scene in which Mariamne worms out of Sohemus the secret of Aristobulus' murder is a *coup de maître*, full of impassioned strength; and the skill which devised the death of Sohemus with his equivocal "I forgive me, Herod," as the last straw to break the back of the king's hesitancy, is beyond praise. Indeed, for this work it is impossible for any one not to have an enduring regard, to hold it to be a really excellent example, not only of fine poetry, but of dexterous dramatic execution and pure artistic feeling.

What has been said above will, without doubt, indicate the very remarkable and, indeed, exceptional merits of Mr. Phillips' work. It has been shown to be impregnated with all those qualities of poetry which delight, hearten, and inspire. In poetic workmanship its inherent promise must also be noted. The verse is easy and flowing, dignified and sonorous. Everywhere there is evidence of a patience and care to polish which is responsible for many passages of verse as beautiful as correct. But it is also responsible for a certain lifelessness, or mechanicalness, in places. Mr. Phillips has yet to learn that although the detail and finished workmanship of a Meissonier and the prettiness of a Watteau have an effect of a kind, the broader canvas and bolder brush-stroke have produced masterpieces that create effects immeasurably greater. In the restraint he exercises on his diction, his ellipses, as well as in his use of predestination as a dramatic implement, he follows classic models. But the language of his best poetry is English, and very pure English: in five lines taken at random there are only three words of foreign origin. This affection for the native tongue is laudable, but the endeavour to restrict himself to its use as far as possible causes Mr. Phillips to give to some words a meaning which they hardly bear. A poet who aspires to the Laureateship of literature cannot afford to neglect any part of the copious speech with which our hybridity and our world-wide connections have endowed us. The assertion has been made in several quarters that Mr. Phillips has not yet found his own medium. And it is hardly possible to

disagree with this statement. He is still experimenting; He has given us some admirable Miltonic verse: much of his work might well be considered imitations of Tennyson's sweetest idyllic poetry; and at times, in his dramatic work, and particularly in *Herod*, we have passages with a true Shakespearean ring.

"Am I that Herod
Who builded yonder amphitheatre
Rivalling Rome? who lured into these ports
Wealth of the world, a Temple have conceived
That shall dispyramid the Egyptian kings?
That so have lived, wrought, suffered, battled, loved?"

Examination of Mr. Phillips' work gives birth to a faith in his ability to throw off this academic stage, to discard, once and for all, the direct influence of his great predecessors, and find, as it were, his own literary feet. He possesses in full measure the gift of virile and penetrative imagination that adds distinctness of outline and emotional power to what he writes. He has, besides, the gift of reflection which, when combined with a wider experience of what is the first and foremost interest in his work, humanity, will infinitely empower his pen. In fine, although the persistent overpraising of everything and anything nowadays gives one pause, it may be said, with perhaps excess of caution, that his works bear evidence of great poetic faculty and of uncommon dramatic power, both as yet not fully developed, but both showing signs of a growth the extent of which, if ordinary circumstances prevail, we can have no conception at the present time.

ERNEST A. SAVAGE.

HENRY GEORGE'S BIOGRAPHY.¹

FOR at least fifteen or sixteen years Henry George stood in the full glare of world-wide publicity, as a writer and speaker on some of the most controversial topics of our time. The book by which he became famous, *Progress and Poverty*, created as great a stir amongst social reformers as did the *Origin of Species* amongst scientists. Some of the most robust and active intellects in England, such as Huxley, Harrison, and the ubiquitous Duke of Argyll, thought him a foeman worthy of their steel, and for a season at least his theory of land-law reform became the universal theme of discussion amongst political clubs and debating societies throughout the land. The British public, indeed, eventually gave him the cold shoulder because they did not relish the "confiscation" proposals which he advocated; yet there remained, and still remain, a loyal minority of reforming spirits who are fully convinced that the path which Henry George pointed out is the one which must, sooner or later, be followed if any substantial amelioration of the social condition of the people is to be effected. The movement for the taxation of land values, of which so much has been heard of late years, may be regarded as the thin end of the wedge of George's main proposal, since the difference between the two schemes is one of degree rather than of kind, and the arguments are usually drawn from the same source. Amongst professors of what used to be called the "orthodox political economy" George's book fell like a thunderbolt; all felt the weight of the blow, but some affected to treat it with a kind of supercilious scorn as the blundering work of a layman meddling with a science which only specialists could handle; some more acknowledged themselves converted, while others, rather than endorse the conclusions of the author, abandoned, as indeed some independent thinkers had already done, the elaborate edifice which Ricardo and Mill had reared, and sought a new foundation for their reasoning elsewhere.

Probably no man, working, as George did, single-handed, has in such a short space of time ever left so deep an impression upon the current thought and the legislative tendencies of the age in which he lived. He confounded that frigid doctrine, till then generally

¹ *The Life of Henry George.* By Henry George, junr. New York: Doubleday, Page and Co. London: W. Reeves. 1900.

accepted, which sees in human fecundity nothing but misery and despair, and replaced it by one which vindicates the rank of man in the creative plan, and inspires fresh hope for the future of society. He placed the responsibility for the sorrow and wretchedness which he saw around him, not upon the "niggardliness of nature," nor on the "improvidence" of providence, but upon institutions established by man and removable by man. He saw and described, more vividly than any writer who preceded him, the true responsible relation in which each man stands towards the economic machine of which he forms a part; he lit up with a fresh light the labyrinthine paths of production and distribution, and brought the repellent and barren subject of taxation within the illuminating circle of his philosophy. The generation that has read *Progress and Poverty* does not look upon landed property with the same religious veneration as did its predecessors. And if it still hesitates or refuses to put George's plan in practice, it can at least be substantiated that the English people were never distinguished for carrying their convictions, either in politics or religion, at once to their logical conclusions.

The effect which George produced in England alone is really astonishing when we think of what few weapons he had. An utter alien to the British nation, he had not a solitary advantage in the way of social, literary, or political connection to smooth his paths. His first introduction to Britishers was in the capacity of newspaper correspondent under the auspices of that *persona grata* of all true British patriots, Patrick Ford, of the *New York Irish World*, and he was first heard of in England as a political prisoner in an Irish gaol under the Crimes Act, during the stormy period of Mr. Forster's Chief Secretaryship. These were rather dubious claims to British hospitality. But he had one resource from first to last, and it outweighed every disadvantage and conquered every prejudice—viz., the clear, comprehensive logic and optimistic charm of his book. All his readers, even those who from interest or conviction differed from him, became his admirers. The hospitality which he received from British audiences, which was warm and general, was intellectual in its origin; when they read the book they wanted the man.

It was but natural that the professional economists of his time should sneer at George for his want of scientific, or at least academic, training, thereby inferring his unfitness for the task he had undertaken. The fact that his book was being read by the thousand, while their own ponderous tomes lay neglected on the library shelves with the leaves still uncut, must have been irritating to their professional self-esteem. But in spite of the pedantry and foppiness of the schools, no man who ever undertook to write about political economy was better qualified than he was—by training as well as by nature—to generalise on the subject of the production and diffusion of wealth. Most of our English economists have been schoolmen and

reclines; Ricardo himself, and later, Bagshot, may be said to be the only ones who united high reasoning powers with extensive personal observation of the movements of wealth. Now if there is any method at all in the madness of what is called political economy, it must be sought for, not in the cloisters of tradition-ridden universities, but right in the thick of the great modern struggle for wealth. Where that struggle exists in its simplest form, where it is least disguised by custom and artificial regulation, and the disturbing elements are so few that they can be approximately allowed for—that is the best station for gathering data for an economic theory. It is just the same with astronomy. Instead of the noble science which to-day we call by that name, we should still have had astrology with us if scholastic tradition and snobbery did not give way to extensive and systematic observation of astral phenomena. Even yet astronomers are glad to travel over half the earth for a successful peep at a solar eclipse or a transit of Venus.

What a clear atmosphere and favourable visual conditions are to the astronomical observer, a new country inhabited by a money-making people is to the economic observer. There the primary terms which, in the economic systems of older countries, occasion so much confusion and perplexity, are easy to define, while their relation to each other is abundantly exemplified. There land is in no danger of being confounded with capital or with wealth. It is seen to be what it really is—namely, the free gift of nature and the raw material of all production. Labour, too, is seen to be the producer of all wealth, whilst its wages is seen to consist of the wealth so produced. When Mill said that the inductive method of reasoning was inapplicable to economic phenomena, because a man could not make experiments upon them at will, he under-rated the facilities which a newly settled country like California afforded for the observation of the very kind of phenomena which had to be reconciled, and which made artificial experiments unnecessary. The report that gold had been discovered in unlimited quantities brought to California a large and heterogeneous population from all parts of the world. These people came avowedly in quest of wealth, and they bore as close a resemblance to the "economic man" of the text-books as concrete flesh can produce. They owned their own capital in the shape of their pick-axes and shovels, and their remuneration for each day's work consisted of the quantity of gold dust which they had washed down in the course of the day. For a time everything went on merrily, and wages, we are told, were higher than anywhere else in the world. But railways came, and with them came land speculation, and soon wages began to descend, until there was nothing left of California's alluring prosperity but ruin and disappointment for her adventurous population.

Henry George saw all this. He came, like the rest, in search of

hustled aside until it had accounted for the talent with which it was entrusted. *Progress and Poverty* was written in the author's leisure moments while holding the unadorned and ill-paid position of Inspector of Gas-meters for the State of California. Even after it was written it would probably not have been published if George had not been, like so many other American literary celebrities, a practical printer himself. George believed in himself and in the enduring qualities of his work, and, in spite of his poverty, his obscurity, the prejudice of publishers, and the indifference of the reading public, the book was at last published and a chance of a fair hearing secured for the proposals it contained.

Just at this time a great land agitation happened to be going on in Ireland, and the cause of the discontented peasantry excited widespread sympathy in the "Greater Ireland" across the Atlantic. Patrick Ford, of New York, whose mission was and is, from the editorial chair of the *Irish World*, to interpret the lesser Ireland to the greater, had got hold of a copy of George's book. He saw that a prophet had arisen in the land, and one who could be useful to him. Agitators like Parnell, Dillon, and Biggar were differing as to what amount of rent a landlord ought in fairness to be paid, but here was a philosopher whose definition of a fair rent was no rent at all, and who defended that position through hundreds of pages with such impregnable logic that he was just the right man to pour fresh fuel on the fire and to fan the wavering agitation into glorious activity. To Ireland George went accordingly, where, as we have seen, he lost his liberty for a few hours, but gained considerable publicity and a cheap advertisement for his hitherto neglected book. It did not take him long to find out, while in Ireland, that though there were several points of contact between his views and those of the Irish land-agitators with whom he mingled, their main proposals and his lay in different directions and could not long be reconciled. He held that there was nothing peculiar or abnormal in the poverty of the Irish tenantry; it was only a particular illustration of a general rule: that private ownership of land, whether it was absentee-ownership, residential-ownership, or peasant-ownership, was hurtful to the community as a whole, either in Ireland or anywhere else. They, on the other hand, did not condemn land-ownership as an institution, but only the particular form of it which existed amongst them, and the general drift of their plans seemed to be to substitute a large class of small proprietors for a small class of large ones. He became conscious that he was out of place amongst a knot of "small men" whom a successful wave of agitation had brought to the top, and none of whom, with the conspicuous exception of Michael Davitt, could be brought to see the subject in the broad philosophic light in which he regarded it. He felt that he was being to some extent boycotted by the Irish leaders. Then

came the imprisonment of Parnell, and, shortly afterwards, the peculiar arrangement known as "the Kilmainham Treaty," the upshot of which was that the Irish agitation was henceforward to be conducted upon political rather than upon economic lines. Home Rule was to be pushed to the front and the land question was to be relegated to the rear, in view of prospective remedial legislation to be brought in by Government, and under these conditions George's utility in the field of Irish politics entirely ceased.

His Irish experience, fruitless in its primary aims, became the turning-point in his career. It found him obscure and unheeded, and it left him a public man with an audience always ready to listen to him, so much so that when he returned to America he was recognised as the friend of Ireland's "Uncrowned King," and welcomed and feasted by politicians of all classes, with the calculating enthusiasm which comes from a knowledge of the power of the Irish vote. But the mantle of the Irish patriot never fitted him, and he lost no time in exchanging it for that of the cosmopolitan philanthropist, in which he appeared to the best advantage.

Henceforward his life may be said to have been one continuous propaganda on behalf of the principles which he had promulgated in *Progress and Poverty*. He lectured extensively in the United States, Great Britain, and Australasia, exciting wherever he went keen discussion of the radical principles of economic justice and making many converts and disciples. As a lecturer and writer he achieved so much success that, if he had been less whole-hearted in the cause, he might have amassed a snug competence out of his earnings; but he was not a business man, and, with the true apostolic spirit, he gave largely to the movement what he got from the movement, so that it needed the active munificence of two of his most ardent sympathisers to keep the wolf from his door during the impairment of health which afflicted his latter years. To him landlordism was the central cause of most of the world's present misery, and all roads led up to it. No time, place, or occasion was too good or too bad to be utilised for an indictment of the present social system. He plunged into the New York City mayoralty campaign—an office whose traditions of political servility and venality had little in common with the principles he taught—not because he liked the atmosphere of the office, but because of his eagerness for the fray, and for the opportunity it gave him for demonstrating the injustice of the social arrangements of large cities like New York. An anecdote in the biography before us, bearing on this point in George's history, is too good to be omitted here. When he was running for the mayoralty a member of the opposition waited upon him and tried to induce him to desist as he had no chance of success. "You tell me," said George, "I cannot possibly get the office; why, if I cannot possibly get the office, do you want me to

withdraw?" The reply was: "You cannot possibly get the office, but your running will raise hell!" "Then," said George, "you relieve me of embarrassment; I do not want the responsibility and the work of the office of Mayor of New York, but I do want to raise hell." He did not succeed in "raising hell," unless by the latter expression we are to understand Tammany Hall and its allies, but he polled the substantial minority of 68,000 votes, consisting mainly of working men who, sinking temporarily their sectional differences of opinion, recognised in George a leader of sufficiently comprehensive views to voice the aspirations of oppressed labour. His second candidature for the same office, conducted as it was amid such stormy conditions, and resulting as it did in the candidate's untimely death, is still fresh in the reader's recollection. It is not too much to say that he sacrificed his life for what he believed to be the furtherance of human happiness, although many who approve of his social philosophy will doubt the wisdom of his excursions into practical politics.

Besides *Progress and Poverty*, George published several works on economic subjects, but none of them attracted the same degree of popularity as did that epoch-making book. In fact, his subsequent books may be regarded as amplifications and re-statements of the philosophy of the former work, though their derivative character does not impair the loftiness of conception and felicity of demonstration which distinguish everything he wrote. His real work was done when he showed the world the Gordian knot in its economic system. He was disappointed that economists generally had, outwardly at least, ignored his teaching, and that in none of their works written since the publication of *Progress and Poverty* did his theories find acceptance or, with slight exceptions, even mention. This attitude he attributed to the all-pervading influence of the vested interests whose fundamental position he had assailed, and he consoled himself with Macaulay's remark that the binomial theorem and the law of gravitation would equally have been hushed up if there was anything in them which ran counter to these same vested interests. The abandonment by so many writers of the old deductive political economy contemporaneously with the publication of his book, and the new-born zeal for the "historical" or Continental method, with its gloomy prospects of perpetual search before it, was regarded by him as a tacit admission that there was no escape from his conclusions on the lines of inquiry hitherto followed. In other words, the defenders of the existing economic order only decided to take refuge in history after they had been defeated in the field of deductive reasoning. And, in fact, this view is not without independent corroboration. Thus, Mr. Thorold Rogers, in the preface to his *Economic Interpretation of History*, says:

"I cannot agree with Mr. George, but I am amazed to find how popular his theory is. It is entirely the outcome of economic fallacies hitherto treated as indisputable truths. The unearned, and according to Mr. George, entirely undeserved, increment is the key to the passionate, seductive proposals of *Progress and Poverty*. Now, the impulses bred by this remarkable book are not met by definitions and logomachies. They may be explained away in great part by historical facts, and by the accurate analysis of present conditions. But they never will be so long as people cling to Ricardo, and to absolute theories of an analogous kind."

Still it would be incorrect to date the abandonment of the Ricardian method from the publication of *Progress and Poverty*. Even Mill himself towards the end of his life gave up the wage-fund theory. F. D. Lange published a refutation of it in 1866, and Cliffe Leslie, writing two years later, showed its fallacy in an article in *Fraser's Magazine*. Therefore in so far as George attacked this part of the old economic doctrine, he was merely slaying the slain. For at least a decade before the publication of George's book, the foundations of the edifice had been giving way, and there was consternation among its inhabitants: witness the attempt made in 1876 to expel the Economic Section from the British Association, and the unsparing criticism of the science and its methods by Mr. Ingram, the President of the Section, in 1878. However, on the whole, there can be no doubt that George's work hastened, if it did not originate, the evacuation of the house that Ricardo built, and that, but for his conclusions, many who have since condemned the deductive system as if it were wholly false would have been content to merely modify its postulates, and correct its deductions by the light of fresh experience.

Whatever chagrin George may have felt at the coldness and indifference shown him by the professors was more than compensated for by the favourable verdict of the common people—a people who belonged to no one land and who included all races and conditions of men throughout civilisation. He had the satisfaction during his too short life of seeing his doctrines take deep root in all the English-speaking parts of the globe—nay, even in "jealous China and strange Japan." In far-off New Zealand, as Mr. Henry D. Lloyd¹ testifies, George's name is

"everywhere spoken of with the greatest admiration. Premier Ballance quoted him as an authority for one of the details of his land-tax scheme, and referred to him as the greatest authority on the land question who has revolutionised public opinion. Ballance described as his ideal tax a tax on the value of land less improvements; it is the intention gradually to lead up to the pure land-tax."

So far from George's teachings perishing with himself, as many thought and hoped, there is abundant evidence that they are real living forces which modern society has to reckon with. The

¹ *Newest England*. By Henry D. Lloyd. Page 120.

practical application of the economic equality which he championed may be reserved for a more logical race than now inhabits this planet, but the principles which he laid down are true in that they are universally applicable, and once uttered, cannot be extinguished. Western civilisation has already practically conceded the political equality of all citizens, and from this stage the transition to economic equality is only a question of time. All will depend upon how long it will take nations to find out that political rights which do not include the right to live are delusions. The line of justice in politics is not often the line of least resistance, and institutions whose roots go back to the time of the Norman Conquest, or farther, are not to be upset in a day. In all probability it is to those new and thrifty English-speaking communities in the Antipodes or in the New World—communities not yet demoralised with the vice of aggressive patriotism, or encumbered with the remnants of a wasteful feudal institution—that we must look for the first object-lesson in economic organisation on the lines laid down by Henry George. Already we have seen signs of the new light on the southern horizon. The plucky little colony which has shown the mother-country how to solve the Old Age Pension problem and the strike problem, may well take the lead in the settlement of the land question. And when the distinguished visitor of antiquarian tastes who, as Macaulay predicted, will one day arrive from that country to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's, he may find that edifice standing where it does now, and may proceed to sketch instead the ruins of landlordism.

THOMAS SCANLON.

WESTERN SCIENCE FROM AN EASTERN STANDPOINT.

NATURAL Science is the foundation-stone of modern civilisation. The last century boasts of more inventions than all the previous centuries of human history put together. Science has done many wonders, and promises to do many more. It is moving on and on : the goal of scientific and industrial progress of one generation becomes the starting-point of the next.

After the close of this remarkable century of brilliant inventions it may not be profitless to pause for a moment and inquire how they have affected the well-being of humanity, especially of the teeming inarticulate millions outside the pale of Western civilisation, who constitute the greater portion of mankind.

The more important applications of Natural Science which have affected any considerable section of the human community may be conveniently grouped under the following heads :

I. The labour-saving machinery which has been so largely utilised in manufacturing, mining, and agricultural industries.

II. The railway, steam navigation, and the electric telegraph, which, by almost annihilating distance, have greatly facilitated trade and intercourse.

III. A variety of inventions like the phonograph, photography, &c., which add to our comforts or refined enjoyments.

IV. Improved guns, rifles, and other munitions of war.

I.

Labour-saving machinery may be said to have benefited humanity by cheapening production, and thus placing within the reach of the poorer classes comforts and decencies of life which they could not command before. To a large section of the Orientals, however, the benefit is of a highly questionable character. In the first place, the cheap machine-made articles of the West have destroyed most of their indigenous manufactures. Thus the profits of such manufactures, instead of remaining in the country and enriching it, now go out of it and swell the drain from the East to the West ; and the great majority of the artisan populations being suddenly thrown

upon agriculture for their livelihood, the pressure upon land has increased considerably, to the serious detriment of the agricultural and labouring classes. The Orientals make faint efforts here and there to compete with the Europeans; but, under present conditions, there is hardly any hope that they will ever be able to do so successfully, except in independent and Europeanised Japan. Depressed by the loss of their independence, total or partial, poorer than the poorest nation of the West, and without any scientific or mechanical training in the Western sense, they have to run a race with a people who have had the start of a century, and who are armed with all the advantages of accumulated capital—not a small portion of which is derived from the exploitation of the East—of long scientific and mechanical training, and of the assurance engendered by conscious strength. As Mr. C. H. Pearson observes in his *National Life and Character*:

“Let us conceive the leading European nations to be stationary, while the black and yellow Belt, including China, Malaysia, India, Central Africa and Tropical America is all teeming with life, developed by industrial enterprise, fairly well administered by native governments, and owning the greater part of the carrying trade of the world. Can any one suppose that, in such a condition of political society, the habitual temper of mind of Europe would not be profoundly changed? Depression, hopelessness, a disregard of invention and improvement would replace the sanguine confidence of races that at present are always panting for new worlds to conquer.”¹

Besides ruining the indigenous industries of the East, the cheap and attractive manufactures of the West turned out by labour-saving machinery have generally had the tendency of unduly and prematurely raising the standard of living among peoples brought under Western influence. Men are everywhere ruled more or less by fashion; even the most rational men are found among its most irrational votaries. The desire for show or decencies of life appears to be almost innate in all classes in all parts of the world. Formerly, however, the gratifications of their desire among the Orientals was determined by the indigenous standard of comfort and luxury which was well adapted to their material condition. But at the present day there is a marked tendency among the upper and middle classes to adopt the Western standard of necessities and luxuries. These have been made cheap and attractive by the labour-saving machinery, and therein lies their danger. They are bought more because they are cheap, attractive, and fashionable than because they are necessary. In the West, modern civilisation has raised the standard of living considerably. There the rise, though fraught with evil consequences, as we shall see hereafter, has been attended by some compensating advantages. In the East, however, the spread of the

Western standard of comfort and convenience, without the previous accumulation of wealth and the preparation of mechanical talent as in the West, is an unmitigated evil, and cannot imply progress either present or prospective. The development of Western tastes and Western habits in the Orientals in the present state of their industrial development means, in the case of those few who can afford it, the further enrichment of the already rich capital classes of the West and the corresponding impoverishment of the already poor industrial classes in the East; and in the case of those who cannot afford such development—and they are by far the most numerous class—it means also pecuniary embarrassment and possible ruin, the sacrifice of necessities to luxuries, of substance to shadow.

Not only are the benefits conferred by labour-saving machinery on at least a considerable section of humanity of a questionable character, but they have also to be weighed against positive evils of a serious nature. It is labour-saving machinery which has created and fostered capitalism, one of the greatest curses of the Western social state. No industry on a small scale and with a small capital can be remunerative at the present day. Concentration of capital is the essential condition of industrial development on Western lines, whether manufacturing, mining, or even agricultural, because of the heaviness of the cost of machinery. The success or failure of an industry depends chiefly upon the scale and quality of the machinery, and therefore upon the amount of capital. The larger the capital, the more will it command high-class expensive machinery, the more consequently will be the profit. So capital begets capital and goes on growing. It is, however, always confined within a small class. True, industries are now mostly conducted by joint-stock organisation, and anybody can have a share in it. But the poorer classes are debarred from the privilege, partly on account of their poverty and partly on account of the speculative character, partaking more or less of the nature of gambling, of most Western enterprises. Thus capital tends to be concentrated within a small section of the richer portions of the community, which has the monopoly of it, and, therefore, of the industries for which it is indispensable. The number of capitalists grows, but in inverse proportion to the number of the wretched poor on the brink of starvation. If in the West the number of millionaires has increased by tens, the number of the abject poor has increased by thousands. The whole world is gradually becoming the theatre of operations of coteries of adventurous and certainly not over-scrupulous Western capitalists. The peoples of the East, and partly also those of the West, are exploited for their benefit. They regulate the wages of the labouring classes, which are everywhere kept at a subsistence figure, control the markets of the world, and to a great extent determine the domestic as well as the foreign policy of the Western Powers. The pugnacious

propensity of the Occidental often breaks out in prolonged strikes and determined riots, but the more peace-loving Oriental usually submits to his fate with quiet resignation.

The evils of modern capitalism have been forcibly pointed out by Western writers. In the wake of modern science, marching onward with long and rapid strides, has closely followed in the West poverty of a type hitherto unknown. In the forcible words of Professor Huxley, this poverty is

"a condition in which food, warmth, and clothing, which are necessary for the mere maintenance of the functions of the body in their normal state, cannot be obtained; in which men, women and children are forced to crowd into dens where decency is abolished and the most ordinary conditions of healthful existence are impossible of attainment; in which the pleasures within reach are reduced to brutality and drunkenness; in which the pains accumulate at compound interest in the shape of starvation, disease, stunted development, and moral degradation; in which the prospect of even steady and honest industry is a life of unsuccessful battling with hunger rounded by a pauper's grave. I take it to be a mere plain truth, that throughout industrial Europe there is not a single large manufacturing city which is free from a large mass of people whose condition is exactly that described, and from a still greater mass, who, living just on the edge of the social swamp, are liable to be precipitated into it."

"About one-third of the total population of London [says Dr. A. R. Wallace] are living miserable poverty-stricken lives, the bulk of them with grinding, hopeless toil, only modified by the still worse conditions of want of employment, with its accompaniments of harassing anxiety and partial starvation. And this is a true picture of what exists in all our great cities, and to a somewhat less degree of intensity over the whole country. There is surely very little indication here of any improvement in the condition of the people. Can it be maintained—has it ever been suggested—that in the early part of the century more than one-third of the inhabitants of London did not have sufficient of the bare necessities of life? In order that there may have been any considerable improvement, an improvement in any degree commensurate with the vast increase of wealth, a full half of the entire population of London must then have lived in this condition of want and misery; and I am not aware that any writer has ever suggested, much less proved, that such was the case. I believe, myself, that in no earlier period has there been such a large proportion of our population living in absolute want below the margin of poverty, as at the present time."¹

As corroborative of this statement, Dr. Wallace cites figures from the reports of the Registrar-General to show that the proportion of deaths in workhouses, hospitals, and in other public institutions for London, and also for England and Wales, has been increasing for the last thirty-five years. In 1861-65 the proportion was 16.2 per cent.; in 1892-96 it was 26.2. In England and Wales suicides have increased most alarmingly, from 1847 in 1861 to 2796 in 1895, the increase in population during the same period having been from

¹ *The Wonderful Century*, pp. 345-346.

67 per million to 92 per million. Crime has increased within the last thirty years, and at a much greater rate than the increase of the population for the same period.

"The evidence for the enormous increase of the total mass of misery and want [says Dr. Wallace] is overwhelming, while that it has increased even faster than the increase of population is, to my own mind, almost equally clear."¹

Such is the picture of the present condition of the mass of the people in the West drawn by foremost Western writers, themselves eminent men of science skilled in weighing evidence.

It seems to us an almost inexplicable enigma that Western writers, while they earnestly deprecate capitalism, should be blind to the principal cause which promotes it; so much so, indeed, that they often further it by their own action. The same physicist or chemist who will in his study or on the platform anathematise the capitalists for their iniquitous conduct will, perhaps, in his laboratory invent some machinery or discover some compound which will feed and fatten the capitalists. It is like adding fuel to the fire while bemoaning its destructive effects.

Besides capitalism, over-production is another serious evil caused by labour-saving machinery. A great deal more is produced by the West than is required by it. Consequently the manufacturers of the West have to seek for markets in Asia and Africa. Hence the exploitation and spoliation of these continents by the Western Powers. They are impelled to this career of aggression by sheer necessity. They cannot help it. There are men in the West who sincerely wish to live up to the commandments of the sublime religion which they profess. Not long ago the Peace Rescript of the Czar evoked enthusiastic and sympathetic response from all the centres of Western civilisation. But, all the same, the armaments of Europe have been increasing apace; and they will continue to increase apace—peace rescripts and peace associations notwithstanding—so long as natural science continues to multiply its inventions and discoveries. New markets—which in Western vocabulary has come to mean possessions, or spheres of influence—must be found for the ever-increasing manufactures of Europe.

Over-production and capitalism—the effects, as we have seen, of the industrial application of modern science—are the principal causes of the growing spirit of militarism and imperialism in the West. The large armies and navies maintained by the greater Western Powers are as much for defence at home as for defence and offence abroad, for the protection and expansion of their interests in Asia and Africa. The great wars of the future will be fought, not for interests in Europe, but for interests outside Europe. The settled policy of the Great Powers is to partition Asia and Africa

¹ *The Wanderful Century*, p. 363.

among them, and diplomatic and peaceful delimitation of spheres of influence will probably not be always practicable. But, so far as Orientals are concerned, there seems at present little reason to doubt that the strongest among the European Powers will carry on the work of Western expansion in the East.

Having brought the greater portion of Asia and Africa under subjection or control, the Western Powers are able, by the construction of railways, to facilitate the transport of Western goods, which, being cheaper and more showy, though less substantial than the indigenous article, have a better sale. The hand-made manufactures of the East cannot long compete with the machine-made manufactures of the West. The progress of natural science in the Western world has effected a revolution in industrial methods; the day of mere manual skill is gone by. This revolution has taken the Orientals by surprise. They were not prepared for it; they have not had the time to prepare themselves for it; and the result is, they are simply paralysed.

The East being governed or controlled mainly in the interest of the West, tariffs protecting indigenous against foreign goods do not exist there, though such tariffs are still found necessary in many of the highly developed countries of the West. The absence of tariffs and the extension of railways are among the principal causes which have helped to destroy our indigenous industries and considerably handicapped us in our endeavours to revive them. We are becoming more and more dependent upon Europe for most necessities of life, except food, not to speak of luxuries. The peoples of the East (except the Japanese) have neither the capital, nor the mechanical knowledge and enterprise, nor the eagerness for accumulation of wealth which is necessary to compete with the Western peoples. Free trade in their case means their exploitation by the West without any equivalent advantage to them.

The notion is prevalent in some circles in the West that the Europeans are on a benevolent mission of progress and civilisation in the East. The placid self-complacency with which such assertions are made would almost make one suspect a vein of irony in them. The primary test of benevolence is self-sacrifice. Any action the mainspring of which is self-interest, especially pecuniary interest, cannot be dignified as benevolent. Granting that the spread of the highly material civilisation of the West would be beneficial to humanity, a very questionable supposition to say the least, can it be said that the Europeans are impelled thereto by any but interested motives, and often interested motives of the most sordid character? Leaving aside the question of benevolence, however, if the Europeans had settled among the peoples they subjugated, there would in all probability have been some good result. They would then have identified themselves more

or less with the interests of the people among whom they settled, and would have gradually got more or less mixed and bound in ties of sympathy with them. In the history of the world we have many instances of countries in which the governing classes were naturalised foreigners, and which have made considerable progress in civilisation. India, China, and England are conspicuous instances of such countries. But we are not aware of a single country which has left its mark in history under absentee alien rule. Any form of bureaucracy which determines what is supposed to be good for its subjects without consulting their wishes and taking their help—without, in short, closely associating them with it—is not likely to succeed in its purpose. The failure becomes greater and more certain when the bureaucracy is a foreign one, with a civilisation entirely different from that of the people. The truth of this proposition is so obvious that it is incredible it should be so generally forgotten by the Western nations; it is incredible, indeed, that foreign rulers should not associate the people in shaping their administrations. The methods of the political or commercial missionary of the West are such as may well make the realisation of the dream of peace descending in a “drapery of calico,” dreamt of by the Manchester politician, as remote as ever. It is, indeed, strange that he should ever seriously think that he is benefiting peoples while he is depleting their resources, giving them shadows while taking away their substance. Suppose you take possession of an estate which is without your capital and your mechanical knowledge—we shall not inquire how. You effectively prevent thefts on the property, and develop its resources, taking the whole of its yield as the price of your labour and the interest of your capital, except the wage of the proprietors, who work as your labourers. A good portion, if not the whole, of what is left after the cost of their food, is spent upon clothing and little attractive fineries which are manufactured by sections of your community. You do not settle upon the estate, you do not in any way identify yourself with the original proprietors. All the wealth you acquire is spent in a way so as to benefit yourself and your community, except a small fraction of it, which is paid for their labour, which is generally of a menial character. You have, it is true, relieved them of the responsibility of defending the little property they called their own, and even perhaps disburdened them of the arms they possessed. It is possible that, with your fineries which it is your interest to sell them, they assume a more civilised appearance than they ever did before. It is possible that they have, now and then, the comfort of a ride on a railway which you have built, and which you maintain with the proceeds of their estate. But, notwithstanding all this, can the condition of the original owners be said to be better than when they

had freedom, the first condition of progress and happiness, when, though they had to defend their estate against occasional depredations with their own arms and the help of their own people, they had still all the actualities and all the possibilities of real proprietorship? Would it not be a mockery to tell them that they might compete with you if they liked, knowing very well that they have neither your industrial experience nor your capital—augmented not a little, be it remarked, by the profits from their property—nor the prestige and the numerous other advantages conferred by the possession and administration of their estate. The importance of order as a condition of prosperity must not be exaggerated. As in the case of the individual, so in that of the nation, perfect tranquillity is not incompatible with a state bordering upon lifelessness, the negation, if not the reverse of what is usually understood by progress. The tranquillity maintained by a Government in which the people have a substantial share not only indicates development, but also aids it materially in various ways. But the tranquillity maintained by such an exclusive foreign administration, as has been established by the Europeans in various parts of Asia and Africa, can be neither indicative nor promotive of the well-being of the peoples subject to it.

The speech of the Indian Red-Jacket in answer to a European missionary who went to preach Christianity among the American Indians finds an echo in the hearts of many an Asiatic and African at the present day :

“ Brother [said the Red Jacket], listen to what we say. There was a time when our forefathers owned this great island. . . . But an evil day came upon us ! Your forefathers crossed the great waters, and landed on this island. Their numbers were small ; they found friends and not enemies ; they told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men, and came here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat. We took pity on them, granted their request, and they sat down among us. We gave them corn and meat, and they gave us poison (spirituous liquor) in return. The white people had now found out our country, tidings were carried back, and more came amongst us ; yet we did not fear them, we took them to be friends ; they called us brothers, we believed them and gave them a large seat. At length their numbers had greatly increased, they wanted more land, they wanted our country. Our eyes were opened, and our minds became uneasy. Wars took place ; Indians were hired to fight against Indians, and many of our people were destroyed. They also brought strong liquor among us ; it was strong and powerful, and has slain thousands.

“ Brother, our seats were once large, and yours were very small. You have now become a great people, and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country, but are not satisfied—you want to force your religion upon us.”¹

“ Fundamentally [says A. de Quatrefages] the white, even when civilised,

¹ Winterbottom's *America*, quoted in *Colonisation and Christianity* by Mr. Howitt, pp. 399-401.

from the moral point of view is scarcely better than the negro, and too often by his conduct in the midst of inferior races has justified the argument opposed by a Malagache to a missionary: 'Your soldiers seduce all our women. . . . You come to rob us of our land, pillage the country, and make war against us; and you wish to force your God upon us, saying that He forbids robbery, pillage, and war! Go; you are white upon one side, and black upon another.' Such is the criticism of a savage. The following is that of a European, M. Rose, giving his opinion of his own countrymen: 'The people are simple and confiding when we arrive, perfidious when we leave them. Once sober, brave, and honest, we make them drunken, lazy, and finally thieves. After having inoculated them with our vices, we employ these vices as an argument for their destruction.' However severe these conclusions may appear they are unfortunately true, and the history of the relations of Europeans with the populations they have encountered in America, at the Cape, and in Oceania, justify them only too fully."¹

"The condemnation of our system of rule over tributary states is to be plainly seen in plague and famine running riot in India after more than a century of British rule and nearly forty years of the supreme power of the English Government. Neither plague nor famine occurs to-day in well-governed communities. That the latter, at all events, is almost chronic in India, a country with an industrious people and a fertile soil, is the direct result of governing in the interests of the ruling classes instead of making the interests of the governed the first and the only object."²

To quote the same writer, in Africa,

"the result so far has been the sale of vast quantities of rum and gunpowder; much bloodshed, owing to the objection of the natives to the seizure of their lands and cattle; great demoralisation of black and white, and the condemnation of the conquered tribes to a modified form of slavery."³

The application of labour-saving machinery to mining and agricultural industries has, besides contributing to capitalism and over-production, been productive of other evils only a degree less serious. Mining or plantation under modern conditions leads to too quick exhaustion of the mineral or agricultural resources of a country. No thought is given to the future; the present is all that is cared for. One of the strongest arguments adduced in favour of Western expansion is that it develops the backward tracts of the world. The "development," however, is of no advantage whatever to the peoples of those tracts, to whom it means loss of independence, the first condition of progress and happiness, and loss of valuable resources. What would have been the present condition of England, France, and Germany if they had been "developed" in the earlier centuries of the Christian era in the way in which parts of Asia and Africa, not more backward than they were then, are being developed now? The "development" means only the quick enrichment of a few Western companies at the expense, not only of the interests

¹ *The Human Species*. ("International Scientific Series.") Second Edition, pp. 461-462.

² *The Wonderful Century*, pp. 337-340.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 372.

of large existing communities, but also those of countless future generations.

II.

The railway and steam navigation, by promoting friendly intercourse between the East and the West, might have knit the bonds of human brotherhood closer, but have tended only to loosen them by facilitating the transport of Western merchandise, Western troops, and Western engines of destruction, and by rendering possible the government or control of tropical and subtropical regions from temperate Europe. Labour-saving machinery could not have done the harm it has done if it had not been helped by cheap and quick means of transit. For then its produce could not have been sent abroad on such an extensive scale as it is now, nor could it have competed with our hand-made manufactures so successfully as it does now, and the European Powers would not have been so eager to possess or control Eastern markets as they are now.

Never before in the history of man was the establishment of such world-wide empires ever attempted as it has been in recent times by the foremost Western Powers. The extent and solidarity of the modern empires are due mainly to the annihilation of distance by steam and electricity. The ancient empires were not only of much smaller extent than those that are being built up at the present day, but the gulf between the conquerors and the conquered was not so wide as it is now. The conquerors generally had to settle in the lands they conquered. Communication with their parent country was either cut off altogether, as in the case of the Aryans in India, or was slow and intermittent, as in the case of the Greeks in Western Asia. Inter-marriage between the conquerors and the conquered gradually took place. Alexander married a Persian princess and encouraged his officers and soldiers to intermarry. The bigotry even of the Mohammedan conquerors of India gradually wore off, and several of the Mogul emperors of India took Hindu wives. Thus there was a tendency towards the effacement of the line of demarcation between the conquerors and the conquered, and there sprung up sympathetic relations between them. They gradually came to have common interests, common language, and in not a few cases even common religion. The greater majority of the Hindus are the offspring of the Aryan invaders and the non-Aryan aborigines of India, as the English are the descendants of the Saxon and Norman conquerors and the aboriginal population of England.

The object of the Western conqueror or exploiter is to squeeze as much out of the East as possible and enjoy it at home. The facilities afforded by steam communication enable him to do that with ease and comfort. The social barrier between him and the

Oriental is impassable. There can be no lasting and real sympathy between them. It is true the European is not unoften actuated by a high sense of duty, and when his own interest or that of his nation is not concerned, tries to do even-handed justice. But duty and justice can never do a fraction of the good that can be done by love and sympathy.

The exclusive policy invariably adopted by the Europeans in their Eastern dependencies is partly due to this want of sympathy, and partly to the fact that these dependencies are regarded by them as so many preserves for various money-making pursuits; and the moral and economic results of this policy have been most disastrous to the natives. The conquered peoples are, in the words of J. S. Mill,

"without any potential voice in their own destiny. They exercise no will in respect to their collective interests. All is decided for them by a will not their own, which is legally a crime for them to disobey. What sort of human beings can be formed under such a regimen? What development can either their thinking or their active faculties attain under it? A person must have very unusual taste for intellectual exercise in and for itself who will put himself to the trouble of thought when it is to have no outward effect, or to qualify himself for functions which he has no chance of being allowed to exercise."¹

The Eastern dependencies of the Western Powers are being slowly drained of their wealth in the shape of the pay and pension of Western troops and Western officers, civil and military; dividends of the numerous Western companies, profits of Western merchants, &c. This ceaseless and ever-increasing drain, though slow, does, on the whole, incomparably more harm than the occasional though violent depredations of former invaders ever did, just as the almost imperceptible but continuous operation of rainwater, frost and wind does far more serious havoc to the crust of the earth than such cataclysmal convulsions as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions.

III.

One of the most important effects of the innumerable inventions for gratifying our senses has been to multiply our wants and raise the standard of living, and thus to intensify the struggle for existence. The animal necessities of life render a certain amount of struggle almost inevitable. But the object of true progress should be to minimise, not to increase it. The more our energies are absorbed by it, the less room there is for their employment in the higher struggle of the soul for the attainment of a better condition. In ancient times, and, indeed, until recently, the spiritual interest of man was generally held to be antagonistic to his worldly interests.

¹ *Considerations on Representative Government*, chap. III.

Exaltation of the spiritual nature at the expense of the animal was held up as the ideal of human perfection. But the ideal of modern civilisation is material progress, and there is no doubt that it is greatly furthered by the incessant strife and stress necessitated by the continual elevation of the standard of necessities and luxuries. This progress, however, practically means accumulation of wealth by only a small section of the Western community by the exploitation, impoverishment, and virtual enthrallment of the weak and helpless peoples of Asia and Africa; and it is almost incomprehensible to us that such an object should be considered by Western States to be worth such a sacrifice.

Continuous increase of luxury, besides the moral degeneration to which it inevitably leads sooner or later, is attended by other evil consequences of a serious nature. It is undeniable that a large number of the Western working-men are now better lodged, better fed and better clothed than they were half a century ago, but the gulf between their material condition and that of their masters is wider than ever. The relative poverty of the Western working-man has increased where his actual poverty has not. Therein lies the secret of the growing discontent and restlessness even among the comparatively well-to-do labouring classes in Europe. The increase of luxury naturally begins at the top of the social scale. When a desire for it reaches the bottom, as it must do sooner or later, there is heart-burning. With every addition to the wealth and luxury of the upper classes, unless there be a corresponding addition to the wealth and luxury of the lower classes, the latter will be discontented, and will clamour for a rise in their wages and for shorter working hours. After a period of loss and anxiety on the side of the Haves, and of misery and probably also barbarity on the side of the Have-nots, the dispute between them is compromised, but never satisfactorily settled. As the standard of luxury is perpetually rising in the West, the struggle between Capital and Labour is perpetually recurring.

IV.

The influence of the numerous improvements effected in arms and ammunition by modern science has been highly detrimental to the well-being of mankind in general and of the Asiatics and Africans in particular. That the Western nations are becoming alive to a sense of their injurious tendency is shown by the following suggestions from the Czar which were put forward for discussion at the late International Conference :

1. To prohibit the use in armies and fleets of any new kind of firearms whatever, and of new explosives, or any powders more powerful than those now in use either for rifles or cannon.

2. To restrict the use in military warfare of the formidable explosives already existing, and to prohibit the throwing of projectiles or explosives of any kind from balloons or by any similar means.

3. To prohibit the use in naval warfare of submarine torpedo-boats or plungers, or other similar engines of destruction, and to give an undertaking not to construct vessels with rams in future.

Might has always been right in this world. But the improved arms of long range and precision, and the explosives which have so largely come into use in recent times, have made might much mightier than ever before. The weak and ignorant have always been more or less oppressed or exploited by the strong and knowing, but never so extensively, fearlessly, and systematically as at the present day. The unscientific peoples of the world do not now appear to have any other prospect before them than that of hopeless and helpless bondage. They are now entirely at the mercy of the scientific peoples of the West, except where their independence is secured by difficult mountain-fastnesses. Science, however, may yet overcome such natural barriers; and flying cars may one day transport over them Western troops and Western merchandise.

Thus we see that Western science, instead of being the blessing which it was expected and is still supposed to be, has on the whole proved to be rather a curse to large sections of the human race. If it had not been so extensively applied to practical purposes for saving labour, for adding to comforts and luxuries, and for increasing the destructiveness of firearms; if its cultivation had been more confined within the limits of intellectual culture, it would not only have done no harm; but would probably have done an immense amount of good. But its mechanical applications, which are considered by Western writers as its chief title to commendation, are to our mind its chief title to condemnation.

PRAMATHANATH.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

THE study of psychology appears to be spreading rapidly, if we may judge from the number of manuals of the subject which have appeared recently. A second edition of Mr. G. F. Stout's *Manual of Psychology*,¹ has just reached us, and appears to contain some important additions as compared with the original edition. The general arrangement of the book is simple, and the work may be recommended as an introduction to the science of which it treats.

The second volume of the *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution*² takes the form of a memorial of the late Dr. G. B. Goode, who was assistant secretary of the Institution, and whose work in connection with museums and educational institutions is so well known. The greater part of the volume consists of reprints of important papers by the late Dr. Goode on museums and on the beginnings of American Science. Most of these papers are difficult of access in their original form, and all lovers of science will be glad that the memorial to their talented author has taken so useful and appropriate a form. The value of the work is increased by the addition of more than a hundred portraits of scientific men, especially those connected with American Science. It is to be regretted that these have been dispersed at random throughout the volume; their value would have been greater had they been placed together.

The *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for 1899*³ contains several excellent papers, especially one by Mr. G. P. Merrill on the Non-Metallic Minerals, which forms at the same time a guide to the collections in the section of applied geology. The author is evidently not content with simply classifying and exhibiting the minerals under his charge, but he has collected a large amount of useful information respecting their uses and modes of occurrence, so that his paper is practically a series of treatises on various useful minerals. Such minerals as Iceland spar, emery, whet-stones, pumice, and many others, are dealt with very fully, and the particulars given are usually of a practical nature. Mr. O. T. Mason

¹ *A Manual of Psychology*. By G. F. Stout. Second edition. London: W. B. Olive. 1901.

² *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution, 1897*. Vol. II. Washington, 1901.

³ *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution, 1899*. U.S. National Museum, Washington. 1901.

contributes two good articles, one on a primitive frame for weaving narrow fabrics, the other on pointed bark canoes of the Kutenai and Amur. Mr. W. Hough describes an early West Virginia Pottery, illustrations being given of some of the quaint productions of Morgantown. In those early days the potter evidently had many difficulties to contend with both as regards material and labour, and the work turned out was very creditable when all the circumstances are taken into consideration.

The Report of Mr. S. P. Langley, Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution,¹ is a record of good work done, sometimes under considerable difficulties. The Astrophysical Observatory, especially, appears to have carried out some valuable research work on the optical properties of rock salt, and the data obtained will be of importance to all engaged in spectroscopic work. We hope the full account of these investigations will soon be published. As has been customary for some years, the Report is accompanied by an Appendix consisting of a collection of scientific papers which have appeared in various publications during the period covered by the Report. These papers are admirably selected, and may be taken as representing the most advanced scientific thought of the present day. The two papers on the races of the Philippines testify to the interest taken by the Americans in the ethnological tangle which appears to exist in their new possessions.

The University Tutorial Series has been enriched by some excellent works for young students on geometry and algebra. *Deductions in Euclid*,² by Mr. T. W. Edmondson, enable the student to see the geometrical mode of proof at a glance. Some of the propositions seem scarcely to require demonstration, but the rigid requirements of mathematics cannot be ignored.

The *Tutorial Algebra* (Part I.),³ by Mr. Rupert Deakin, is an admirable book. Mr. Deakin has kept in view the principles of the so-called "heuristic" method of teaching, and the collocation of arithmetical and algebraic operations will be found useful.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

THE third volume of Wundt's *Ethics*, translated by Dr. Margaret F. Washburn, treats of the *Principles of Morality and the Departments of the Moral Life*.⁴ The treatment is comparatively brief, thoroughly systematic, and eminently lucid. The psychological basis of morality

¹ *Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution, 1899.* Washington, 1901.

² *Deductions in Euclid.* By T. W. Edmondson, M.A. London: W. B. Clive.

³ *Tutorial Algebra.* Part I. London: W. B. Clive.

⁴ *The Principles of Morality and the Departments of the Moral Life.* By Wilhelm Wundt. Translated by Margaret Floy Washburn, Ph.D. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. New York: Macmillan.

is temperately examined and various theories discussed, and such as are inconsistent with an evolutionary theory of morals set on one side. The imperatives of conscience are shown to be four in number: external and internal constraint—which appears to us to be indistinguishable from *restraint*, which would better convey the idea; and the imperatives of freedom—the first of which is the motive of permanent satisfaction; and the last, which is the highest of all, that of a moral ideal of life. This last alone is in harmony with the idea of illimitable development, and brings into existence the noblest characters. A further analysis reveals to us that moral ends may be included in three classes—the individual, the social, and the humanitarian. The moral scale is concisely expressed in half-a-dozen principles:—Individual:—"Think and act in such a way as never to lose respect for thyself." "Fulfil the duties to thyself and others which thou hast undertaken."

Social:—"Respect thy neighbour as thyself." "Serve the community to which thou belongest."

Humanitarian:—"Feel thyself to be an instrument in the service of the moral ideal." "Sacrifice thyself for that end which thou hast recognised to be thine ideal task."

In accordance with this scheme Professor Wundt surveys the departments of the moral life—the Individual Personality; Society; the State; and Humanity. On all these he has much that is wise and instructive to say, and he rises occasionally into passages of real eloquence.

*The Limits of Evolution*¹ is a topic which naturally suggests itself to religious philosophers, and Dr. Howison discusses it and other subjects from a fresh standpoint, which he describes as that of "Personal Idealism." This appears to be an idealism which is individualistic, and an individualism which is idealistic. The philosophy is pluralistic rather than monistic; each individual is a reality, and God is the supreme reality; but both are dependent and complementary—at least this is what we understand the author to mean. The limit of evolution is that it only concerns physical life—it cannot pretend to pass beyond phenomena; it does not bridge the gulf between the non-living and the living, or explain the genesis of the moral consciousness. It belongs entirely to science, and has no right to intrude into the realm of philosophy. On these lines Dr. Howison pursues his main theme with considerable vigour and some success. Of his competency there can be no doubt, and he is too well informed to question the decisions of science as long as it confines itself to the region of demonstrated facts. Other subjects are considered from the same point of view, the essays of most interest to us being those on Later German Philosophy, the Art

¹ *The Limits of Evolution and other Essays.* By G. H. Howison, LL.D. New York and London: Macmillan.

Principle as represented in Poetry, and the Right Relation of Reason to Religion.

Books on philosophy are often dull reading. We therefore give Dr. Hodder's work, *The Adversaries of the Sceptic*,¹ all the heartier welcome because he has a sense of humour and is not afraid to raise a smile, at the expense of his adversaries, of course. Professors Bradley and Royce come in for the chief share of the author's criticism, which is all the more telling as he confesses himself indebted to them both; but the pupil has outstripped his masters. The book is in two parts; the first treats of the Metaphysics and the second of the Ethics of the Specious Present. Dr. Hodder protests against the introduction of assumptions into metaphysical inquiry. "There is," he says, "a much-neglected principle of metaphysics, namely, that it is not impossible for a philosopher to be mistaken about a thing even before he has examined it." His comment upon an assumption of Mr. Bradley's, that he could not rest tranquilly in a truth if he were compelled to regard it as hateful, is not severer than the case demands. "Mr. Bradley," he says, "proposes, that is, deliberately and perhaps wrongly" ("rightly or wrongly"—the words are his), "to assume that the universe is such and such, and then to 'think up to it'; and Professor Royce dignifies this assumption (not with especial reference to Mr. Bradley, but generally) with the decorative epithet 'Courageous.' An assumption is a flaw in a rounded metaphysics, and to call its introduction there a mark of courage—openly and placidly, almost gaily, to carry the thing off, when one, in fact, has been at one's wit's ends to avoid assuming anything—is a stratagem that would be admirable only if metaphysics were a game of bluff and the universe a card-table." But putting controversy on one side, Dr. Hodder presents his views in a clear and enlightening manner which commends them to the reader, and we especially admire the chapters on the Morality that Ought to Be, and the Morality that Is.

Many people will be glad of the opportunity of obtaining a handy copy of Hume's *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, and such an opportunity is afforded them by a new edition in the Religion of Science Library, well printed, neatly bound in paper covers, and cheap. This is simply a reprint from the edition of 1777, but it would have been more useful had it been supplied with an introduction and notes by some competent editor for the benefit of students. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co.; London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Co.)

"By Christian doctrine," says the author of *The Elements of Christian Doctrine*,² he understands "nothing else but the teaching

¹ *The Adversaries of the Sceptic, or the Specious Present. A New Inquiry into Human Knowledge.* By Alfred Hodder, Ph.D. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co. New York: Macmillan.

² *The Elements of Christian Doctrine.* By T. A. Lacey, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

of Jesus Christ, received and retained in the Christian Society, guarded by the dogmatic definitions of the Church, analysed and systematised by the labours of theologians." This makes all the difference; we have looked in vain in this book for the teaching of Jesus Christ as reported in the Gospels; it is simply an exhibition and exposition of the dogmas of the Church, and as tedious as such expositions always are. "This book is not a theological manual." We must apologise for differing from the author, but it appears to us that it is nothing else. It is also rigorously orthodox.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

IN *The Evolution of Modern Money*¹ Mr. William Warrand Carlike is upon the right lines. Hitherto, curiously enough, whilst nearly all social phenomena have been treated upon the historical and comparative methods, the subject of money has been regarded as the special creation of the legislature. But, as Mr. Carlike rightly points out, centuries before Lord Liverpool's Act of 1816, which legalised the gold standard, gold had been the true standard of value, although no one had recognised the fact. The institution of money, like all other social institutions, grew. It was not created or "adopted." The point upon which, for instance, Lord Liverpool chiefly relied was that his measure altered nothing, but, on the contrary, legalised in every respect the state of things which *de facto* existed at the time. As a writer on jurisprudence once truly said: "The public morality of one generation becomes the law of the subsequent one." Although we must not forget that the reverse is also true, since laws are passed at the initiation and by the intellectual force of the select few, and in course of time become the public opinion of the masses.

However, just as "we blundered into" the English Constitution, so we blundered into the gold standard. Even so acute an observer and hard thinker as Adam Smith spoke of gold as "holding up" the value of silver money, as if a silver standard existed side by side with a gold one.

Believing that the history of the past may be best explained by a close examination of the present, Mr. Carlike deals first with the transition in England in the eighteenth century, comparing this with the exactly analogous changes in ancient Rome. He then reviews the position of gold throughout Europe prior to this transition, showing how gold predominated as the medium of exchange in the

¹ *The Evolution of Modern Money*. By William Warrand Carlike, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1901.

most important transactions. And so through the French currency in mediæval and renaissance times he traces in this country the emergence of the modern system under which gold was the true, though not the popular, standard.

Having thus cleared the ground, he is in a position to trace the origin and growth of money. Amongst the earliest forms of money, figure cattle and sheep, slaves, and various implements and weapons. Later the metals from which those implements and weapons are made are substituted, but alongside of the earliest forms gold and silver ornaments appear to have found a place in primitive currency, indicating, as Mr. Carlile thinks, that the sentimental has had a larger share in moulding human destinies than our too prosaic economical science is accustomed to allow. In primitive societies provision for the future is conspicuous by its absence, but personal adornment is a passion. Thus it is the superfluities that primitive man values most highly, and long before the invention of money, gold and silver ornaments and polished shells and beads attained the monetary status at least as early as necessities and objects of utility. Mr. Carlile has been successful in treating, what might have proved a dry treatise, this subject in a fascinating manner without sacrificing its scientific side. The average reader, as well as the more serious student of economics, will read this book with pleasure and profit.

Although the evils of our present representative system have been long recognised, the question of proportional representation is still in this country in the academic stage. It is otherwise, however, in our Australasian colonies, in many of which various trials have been made of some form or other of proportional representation. Notably in Tasmania a modification of the Hare system has been adopted. This has been described in detail by Professor Jethro Brown in his *New Democracy*, which we noticed in these pages upon its publication in 1899. At that time only one election had taken place, the results of which were considered fairly satisfactory. We now have before us *Proportional Representation Applied to Party Government*,¹ by Messrs. T. R. Ashworth and H. P. C. Ashworth, from which we learn that the second election, held early in the present year, has proved disastrous to the Hare system. The present book seems to be the outcome of the provision in the Commonwealth Act of Australia providing for the election of six senators from each State for the Federal Senate. Upon the question of representation two parties arose. The one contended that the majority in each State was entitled to return all six senators, whilst the adherents of the Hare system claimed that each State might resolve itself into six groups, each group returning one representative. The authors' views may be gathered from the following quotation :

¹ *Proportional Representation Applied to Party Government. A New Electoral System.* By T. R. Ashworth and H. P. C. Ashworth. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1901.

"Majority and minority in and for themselves are the first requisite of popular government and not the development or representation of separate groups." In other words, the two-party system is the best. But here too there must be real representation. The instances of the want of this real representation in this country, and in fact wherever this system prevails, are too notorious to catalogue. The 1895 election, in which the Tory party secured a majority of 150, whereas the true majority was only about 40, is by no means an extreme or solitary example. It is to show how this state of things may be remedied that the authors direct their attention, and in the chapters entitled "The Reform: True Proportional Representation," and "How the Evils of the Present System will be remedied," they have clearly and succinctly set forth the rules to be adopted for attaining this desirable consummation. Their scheme has the supreme merit of simplicity, which cannot be said for the Hare system, and for its details we must refer the politician to the chapters we have mentioned, which should be carefully studied by every one interested in the advancement of democratic institutions.

*The Heart of the Empire*¹ consists of a series of papers by writers who may be considered as more or less experts upon the subjects of which they treat. The scope of the book may be gathered to some extent from its sub-title, *Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England, with an Essay on Imperialism*. But the object is wider. It is not so much an attempt to promote academic controversy upon the questions of the day as to stimulate practical efforts to ameliorate the stern realities of life and to arouse the interest of the masses in the problems that touch their daily lives.

Recognising the concomitant growth of cities and increase in wealth, and the marvellous magnitude of each, these writers, who have lived and worked in both worlds, and are equally at home in the East and West Ends, see the real inequality between the few rich and the teeming poor. They recognise the power which wealth has given to the few over the lives of the many—a power to which that of the feudal baron was as nothing. They treat at its true value the statistics of pauperism which show on paper an annual decrease in pauperism, and they see clearly what the self-complacent upper and middle classes are entirely ignorant of—that the masses who dwell in the acres of mean streets in our great cities are leading lives devoid of all ennobling ideals and steeped in a dreary round of daily toil, unredeemed in its dulness and dreariness by external or internal influences for progress or enlightenment.

In the *Realities at Home*, Mr. Charles F. G. Masterman describes to us in broad outline the life of the average man in a modern city. From its contemplation one may well rise in despair, but, says

¹ *The Heart of the Empire. Discussions of Problems of Modern City Life in England. With an Essay on Imperialism.* London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1901.

the author, "it will at least be a great step forward if educated opinion in this country can realise that 'a menace to the future progress of humanity' is now silently without observation developing in the great cities of England."

One chief cause of retrogression Mr. Masterman only mentions as if it were no longer in operation, viz., individual selfishness, in other words the old narrow individualism of the Manchester school, which we can assure him is still rampant in suburban Tory villadom, and which renders almost impossible any advance in municipal collectivism. Fortunately in London and the great cities this spirit of selfish individualism is rapidly losing ground before the advance of progressive municipalism, and herein to our mind lies hope for the future. Mr. Masterman, however, although he regretfully admits the utter failure of religious denominations to grapple with the problem, still clings to the hope that the Established Church will rouse itself to the realities of the position, cease its internal wranglings, and by adapting itself to the spirit of the times and by renewing its attempt to preach the teaching of its master, will solve the problem before which our boasted civilisation seems paralysed. It may be so, but for our part we believe the doctrines of Christianity have ceased to be a living force. A religion without faith is worse than useless, and that is why all religions are powerless to-day in modern life. The Church, as Mr. Masterman candidly admits, is the church of the millionaire, the landlord, and the brewer. It has identified itself with the party of reaction, and the people know it. But there is more than this. Its doctrines do not appeal to the intelligence of the average man.

Many perhaps will turn first to *The Housing Problem*, by Mr. F. W. Lawrence, which contains much that is suggestive and valuable. In advocating wider streets, however, Mr. Lawrence altogether forgets Betterment as a means of improvement and a source of revenue, and in dealing with better houses he omits to mention the lessons from Glasgow.

The Children of the Town, by Mr. Reginald A. Bray, is a thoughtful attempt to deal with the thorny problem of child education. Fully alive to the disastrous results of the struggle between denominational and undenominational educationalists, he might have arrived at a more practicable reform by a study of the Canadian school system, which in some instances has so successfully solved this difficult question.

Temperance Reform is discussed by Mr. Noel Buxton and Mr. Walter Hoare, whose names are a sufficient guarantee of its treatment. Mr. P. Whitwell Wilson writes on *The Distribution of Industry*, Mr. A. G. Pigeon on *Some Aspects of the Problem of Charity*, and Mr. F. W. Head on *The Church and the People*. Mr. Head would reform the Church before he would allow the Church to

reform the people, and if the people are ever to be reformed by the Church it is clear that the reform of the Church must take place first. The Church, says Mr. Head, has lost its "glad tidings." It no longer appeals to men. "Its duties and its privileges are not over. Only it is waiting, dazzled by all the glare of new truth that has burst upon it in recent years, till it grows accustomed to the light." It is curious how men, otherwise intelligent, are blinded by this bias, political, religious, or what not. Mr. Head, we fear, is hugging a vain delusion. Perhaps the most interesting paper in this series of interesting discussions is *Imperialism*, by Mr. G. P. Gooch, the new editor of the *Echo*, a writer fresh from the University, who has already won distinction with the pen. Mr. Gooch's attack upon the Neo-Imperialism, or Pseudo-Imperialism as we should prefer to call it, is as destructive as it is vigorous. Our country, right or wrong, is the blatant cry of the Tory Jingo, but an Empire founded on fraud, dishonesty, and force is bound to come to grief in the long run, just as a business house or an individual trader. You cannot have one standard of morality for the nation and another for the citizen. And then our national conceit and contempt for everything foreign, and our belief in a special providence favouring us above all other nations! These are matters which if they were not articles of creed with a great mass of the people would be merely the subject of amusing contempt. And again, the spirit of militarism, which so far from elevating the manhood of the nation is rapidly deteriorating the people. Compare, too, our treatment of Home Rule for Ireland and Home Rule for the Rand. What stupendous inconsistency in that great Unionist party under the leadership of that most consistent of so-called statesmen, Joseph Chamberlain! And so on through the whole gamut of foreign politics in recent times. What amazing blunders, what unaccountable vacillations from the strongest foreign minister of the strongest ministry of modern times—Lord Salisbury, "that lath painted to look like iron," as Bismarck truly said, who makes graceful concessions when they are not required, and turns obstinate only when he should conciliate. Mr. Gooch devotes a considerable space to the eternal South African question, and here he hits a good many nails on the head, in which Mr. Chamberlain gets no more than he deserves. If only more of our leading Liberals had the courage of their opinions the party would be in a very different position. Instead, they occupy their time in intestine quarrels and petty squabbles when they should be taking advantage of the constantly recurring openings of one of the most incompetent Governments the country has seen for a century. We have devoted greater space than usual because we feel that this book is so stimulating to thought and action that it ought to be in everybody's hands who has any real regard for his

country's honour and welfare. It is the work not of doctrinaires, but of men versed both in theory and practice, and although we do not agree with much, there is still more of which we can say nothing but good.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

GENEALOGY is not always an interesting study; but much profit, as well as amusement, may be derived from the records, not merely of one family, but of the various families who have successively occupied a historic mansion. In her elaborate and exceedingly learned work on *Swallowfield and Its Owners*,¹ Lady Constance Russell has collected all that is known about the successive proprietors of Swallowfield. In her modest preface, she says:—"I pretend to no style; my work is simply an *olla podrida* from innumerable sources, good, bad, and indifferent." It must be acknowledged, however, that she has exhibited great judgment in the arrangement of her materials. She unquestionably possesses the faculty which is most essential to the historian—a grasp of facts and the power to set them forth lucidly. She begins her narrative with an account of Swallowfield at the Conquest. Amongst the manors mentioned in the Domesday Survey were "Selingfelle" (now Shinfield) and "Soanesfelt," or "Swalfelle" (now Swallowfield). The research of Lady Russell has enabled her to point out that these two manors were not separated till 1558. William FitzOsbern was the first owner of "Selingfelle" and "Swalfelle." He was Lord of Breteuil and "dapifer," or steward, to William the Conqueror. He was a relative of the Conqueror, who spoke of him as his greatest friend. It was at FitzOsbern's suggestion that William, on hearing of the death of Edward the Confessor, resolved to compel Harold to surrender the throne to him in compliance with the previous engagement to that effect. At the battle of Hastings, FitzOsbern, with Roger Montgomery, commanded one of the three divisions. Many other important details with regard to this friend and henchman of the Conqueror are given in Lady Russell's first chapter. William FitzOsbern's eldest son succeeded him as Lord of Breteuil. He had an adventurous career, and died without leaving any legitimate offspring. He made his cousin Roger de Trœni his heir, but his illegitimate son, Eustace, laid claim to the lordship of Breteuil. It was, however, given to Ralph Le Breton, the son of Emma FitzOsbern's daughter, who had married Raoul de Gael, Earl of Norfolk.

¹ *Swallowfield and its Owners*. By Lady Constance Russell. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

The latter, we learn, became possessed of Bretenil, and gave it to his daughter Amicia as her dowry. Henry I. affianced her to his illegitimate son Richard, and then settled on her the barony of Bretenil, but Richard was drowned in the White Ship in 1120, and Amicia married Robert de Beaumont, second Earl of Leicester. So much for the conventional protests by virtuous aristocrats against bars-sinister and blots on the 'scutcheon! The St. John family held Swallowfield in the reign of Henry II., and we find that King John visited the place in 1205. The family of Le Despencer came into possession of Swallowfield by intermarriage with a member of the St. John family. Then, once more, it reverted to the St. Johns. Next came the De la Beches, one of whom was Constable of the Tower. Swallowfield was subsequently a Royal park, having been granted by Edward III. to his daughter Isabella. It is interesting to know that Elizabeth Woodville, Edward IV.'s Queen, was owner of Swallowfield. Henry VIII. granted it to Katherine of Aragon "in anticipation of his marriage." The same monarch afterwards bestowed Swallowfield as a dowry on Anne Boleyn, Lady Jane Seymour, Katherine Howard, and Katherine Parr. The place, therefore, must be regarded as a landmark in the career of England's much-married King! The family of Backhouse, founded by a wealthy London merchant, owned Swallowfield in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It passed then to the Hydes, Lord Cornbury, son of the celebrated Earl of Clarendon, having married Lady Backhouse, widow of Sir William Backhouse. John Evelyn, the diarist, was a frequent visitor at Swallowfield. The Pitt family subsequently owned it, and then the Dodd family. It was in 1820 that Sir Henry Russell bought Swallowfield. In dealing with this portion of her narrative, Lady Russell shows a meritorious devotion to the family whose name she bears. The second Sir Henry Russell, on his way home from India, stopped at St. Helena, and there saw the great Napoleon. The chapter giving his reminiscences of the exiled Emperor is the most interesting in the book. Lady Russell has, indeed, contributed a volume of genuine historical and genealogical interest to contemporary literature. The book is beautifully printed, and the illustrations are excellent.

The life of Savonarola has been written by several biographers; but it can scarcely be said that we have ever yet had a true portrait of the great Dominican "in his habit as he lived." Dr. George McHardy's study of Savonarola in the series called the "World's Epoch-Makers"¹ is both historically accurate and dramatically vivid and picturesque. The execution of the pure-souled, high-minded monk was a crime for which the Church of Rome cannot be held irresponsible. As George Eliot finely said, "power rose against

him not because of his sins, but because of his greatness—not because he sought to deceive the world, but because he sought to make it noble.”

It is impossible to regard M. J. K. Huysmans' extraordinary book, *Sainte Lydwine de Schiedam*,¹ as a mere romance. It is a *bond fide* life of the saint written with just as much blind faith in the marvellous and the supernatural as the works of Jan Gerlac and Thomas a-Kempis on the same subject. M. Huysmans has not only become a Catholic but a mystic, in the most irrational sense of that much-misused word. He seriously assures his readers that Saint Lydwine was conveyed by an angel to Purgatory, and was able by her prayers, as well as by her pious sufferings, to assuage the pain, and even to end the torments of the souls confined there. In spite of the grotesque mediævalism of the author's present views, his style is just as admirable as ever. He is a consummate artist in words, and strangely enough his new-born Catholic zeal has not changed his realistic literary methods. If we merely took cognisance of M. Huysmans' style, and ignored the matter of his book, we should pronounce it a masterpiece. But it is not in this way he would like to be regarded. He writes in the character of a true believer in the miraculous cures at Lourdes, in the stigmata, in the all but divine powers of Catholic saints, who can by their prayers and their sacrifices overturn the laws of Nature—of course, with the assistance of God—and his faith is of that childishly simple kind which defies science and logic. His sketch of European history in the fifteenth century, in the opening chapter of his book, is greatly exaggerated. Kings are all monsters, and statesmen are villains, according to M. Huysmans; and artistically he heightens the effect by throwing into relief the virtues of the saints, although historically his picture is quite false. The portion of the story which reveals to us the sad, terrible life of poor Lydwine, a martyr for years confined to a bed of sickness, and with no consolations, save her piety, and her strange visions is very beautiful. But the supernatural fringe spoils the reality of the portrait. Instead of a study of mediæval history M. Huysmans has given us a legendary biography, written by a master of the art of story-telling, whose mind has been perverted by the silly tales of priests and the enervating atmosphere of incense and effeminate pietism. Perhaps to the student of psychology the development of M. Huysmans' own mind, as disclosed by his recent works, is more interesting than the subjects about which he writes. The man whose analysis of sexual questions was so painfully minute that it somewhat jarred on even such critics as M. Zola, has come to see in every thought about the nature of women, and in every emotion opposed to the idea of virginity, something obscene and detestable.

¹ *Sainte Lydwine de Schiedam*. Par J. K. Huysmans. Paris : P. V. Stock.

"Extremes meet"; and certainly M. Huysmans' mental evolution is a startling manifestation of the truth of this wise saying. In the case of Count Tolstoi we see the growth of asceticism in a mind which originally yielded to the materialism of the age. In the case of M. Huysmans we see, not asceticism, but mediævalism triumphing over reason, culture, and that refined good sense which is the flower of civilisation. It is a form of mental degeneration which would sadden the heart of a philosopher. M. Huysmans can no longer be looked upon seriously as a thinker, and scarcely as a rational being. And yet he remains a literary artist quite equal to Maupassant, scarcely inferior to Flaubert.

The important work published by the great Paris firm of Plon, Nourrit et Cie.—*Un Diplomate Français à la Cour de Catherine II.*¹—throws some interesting light on the character of the Empress Catherine II. The Chevalier de Corberon had the opportunity of studying the celebrated Empress from life. His memoirs, written in a spirit of perfect candour, bring before us the Court of Catherine II. with its intrigues, its singular succession of favourites, its splendour, and its corruption. In spite of her faults—or shall we say her crimes?—Catherine was no ordinary woman. The Chevalier de Corberon's first impression of her was that greatness was stamped on her face, in which he traced a combination of nobleness and amiability. He, however, when he saw more of her, arrived at the conclusion that she was rather a clever woman than a great sovereign, and that she should be characterised rather as a consummate actress than as a powerful ruler. The narrative is brought down to 1780, and enables us to see how Russia, in the midst of a curious *melange* of intrigue, semi-barbarism, and political ambition, gradually came to be recognised as one of the foremost of European powers. The two volumes well deserve the attention of the politician as well as the student of history.

Mr. E. Marston, of the firm of Sampson Low, Marston and Company, has written a delightful little book entitled, *Sketches of Booksellers of other Days*.² He has collected a vast amount of curious information about men who, if they did not possess genius, certainly had some great qualities—industry, endurance, perseverance, and enthusiasm. The life of Jacob Tonson is stimulating, for it shows how a man can become rich from small beginnings. Besides, as the publisher of Dryden's *Translation of Virgil*, and of *The Spectator*, he may be considered entitled to a reflected glory from the brilliant luminaries with whom he was associated. Thomas Gux, another successful bookseller, has given his name to the great London hospital he founded. Of course the greatest of the old booksellers

¹ *Un Diplomate Français à la Cour de Catherine II.* (1775-1780). Journal Intime de Chevalier de Corberon. Avec une Introduction et des Notes. Par L. H. Labande. Paris: Librairie Plon, Nourrit et Cie.

² *Sketches of Booksellers of Other Days.* By E. Marston. London: Sampson Low, Marston & Co.

was Samuel Richardson, who gained such extraordinary celebrity as a novelist. The career of Richardson is a singular example of the unexpected channels that lead to literary fame. Of course, Richardson's reputation has been partly eclipsed by the fame of a greater novelist, Fielding, but it cannot be denied that *Clarissa Harlowe* is a remarkable work of fiction. The sketch of Thomas Gent, an Irishman by birth, will be found particularly interesting. Mr. Marston writes in a charming, unaffected style, and his book is exceedingly enjoyable. It has, moreover, a practical value, inasmuch as it shows how, in earlier days, great authors were aided by the efforts of zealous traders who, brought up in obscurity, had learned to love books and to appreciate genius.

*Les Nouvelles Ameriques*¹ is the title of an exceedingly well written book by M. George Aubert, who has already produced several volumes of great interest. M. Aubert started in the *Deutschland* in October, 1900, for New York, and with a commercial object in view studied life in some of the principal cities in the United States, both from a social and an economic standpoint. He is not quite flattering in his remarks about American trusts, which he unhesitatingly condemns as injurious to the interests of the masses. He also visited Cuba, and was delighted with that gay city, Havana. He was in Columbia while a revolution was raging, and narrowly escaped being shot. His account of Mexico and Guatemala is very lively, but it is rather startling to learn that, owing to the state of morals in the latter country, a virtuous woman's position is very hard!

Mme Isabella Massieu has written a delightfully clear and brilliant work entitled *Comment j'ai par couru l'Indo-Chine*.² This gifted lady is manifestly a close observer, and, as M. F. Brunetiere remarks in his admirable preface, she did not travel in vain through Indo-China. She gives a very curious picture of Siam. The inhabitants of that country are like cruel children. Some of their customs are abominable. Their burials have an element of savagery; and yet they seem to enjoy life thoroughly. Her suggestion that France has neglected her true interests in Siam is worthy of attention. The account of Laos and Tonquin will be read with deep interest. The volume is beautifully illustrated.

M. Jusserand, who deservedly enjoys such a high reputation in his own country, has shown that France may claim the glory of having introduced lawn tennis, football, golf, and cricket into the world.³ Englishmen may be astonished at discovering that they owe to the French their favourite games. But M. Jusserand is an accurate

¹ *Les Nouvelles Ameriques. Notes Sociales et Economiques.* Par Georges Aubert. Paris: Ernest Flammarion.

² *Comment j'ai par couru l'Indo-Chine.* Par Mme. Isabella Massieu. Preface de F. Brunetiere. Paris: Librairie Plon.

³ *Les Sports et Jeux d'Exercices de l'Ancienne France.* Par J. J. Jusserand. Paris: Librairie Plon.

historian, and his account of the "chasses à courre" (coursing), "paume" (tennis), "la soule" (the ancestor of football), and "la crosse" (the ancestor of golf and cricket), is quite authentic. His book should have more than an archaeological interest.

An important work has been issued by the Librairie Stock entitled *La Réforme de la Justice Militaire*.¹ The author's pseudonym, Jean Marsil, thinly disguises the name of a well-known French officer. The subject is handled with much ability, and the book contains some very practical suggestions. The volume is appropriately dedicated to the members of the Government, the senators, and the deputies.

M. George Clemenceau, with characteristic ability, deals with the Dreyfus case, whose history he has endeavoured to place fully and fearlessly before the public. *Justice Militaire*² is a book which should be read by all who desire to know everything that can be known about that extraordinary case, which has convulsed public life in France.

BEILLES LETTRES.

*The Pharaohs of the West*³ is a charming little story, the scene of which is laid in Derbyshire. The title refers to the wild red deer which one of the characters in the book compares to the old kings of Egypt. "For crowns, have they not antlers? have they not copper-coloured skins? are they not the kings of the West? and do we not lay them low even as the great Pharaohs are laid low to-day?" Truly a poetic idea; but is it not rather barbarous for the deer-stalker to "lay low" the poor Western Pharaohs?

*Glendarrach*⁴ is one of those books evidently written for idlers. There is very little in the story, and yet the dialogue is lively and the characters are mostly pleasant people. There is, of course, a happy ending, and those who are pleased with propriety and conventional "perfection" will be delighted with *Glendarrach*.

In the Pitt Press series there is a beautiful edition of Ercmann-Chatrian's *Le Blocus* and *Waterloo*.⁵ The introduction, by Mr. Arthur R. Ropes, leaves nothing to be desired. The notes, too, are admirable.

Cricketers are, as a rule, not literary persons. But there may be such a thing as a literature of cricketing. Mr. C. W. Alcock has done something for this department of literature in his *Cricket*

¹ *Réforme de la Justice Militaire*. Par Jean Marsil. Paris: P. V. Stock.

² *Justice Militaire*. Par Georges Clemenceau. Paris: P. V. Stock.

³ *The Pharaohs of the West*. By F. A. D. London and Derby: Bemrose & Son.

⁴ *Glendarrach*. By Murho. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

⁵ *Le Blocus: Episode de la Fin de l'Empire*. By Ercmann-Chatrian. Edited by Arthur R. Ropes, M.A. Cambridge: At the University Press.

*Stories—Wise and Otherwise.*¹ We give one specimen of these stories:—"When G. J. Bonnor, the Australian giant, on his first appearance at Bramall Lane, Sheffield, came out of the Pavilion to make his way to the wicket, a voice from the crowd sang out, 'Here be Joombo.' Presently Alec Bannerman stepped out in the arena, and the same voice called out, 'Here be little Joombo.'" This anecdote has a touch of realism in it, but we fear it belongs, not to the "wise," but the "otherwise," stories in the book. The Shakespearean mottoes at the end of the volume are very felicitous.

An Englishwoman's Love Letters caused a flutter amongst readers of fiction. They were, perhaps, taken too seriously. A volume entitled, *The Lover's Replies to an Englishwoman's Love Letters* gives a curious explanation of the unfortunate ending of the love affair. The hero appears to be a commonplace man of the world who, though left a considerable amount of wealth by his father, and in a position to travel and improve his mind in every way, spells the name of George Meredith's well-known book, *The Ordeal of Richard Feverel*, wrongly, and cannot spell even the names of some foreign towns visited by him correctly. We gather from the correspondence that the unhappy heroine went mad; but, even so—if we were to regard her as a real person—she had reason to congratulate herself on not being married to a fool.

*The Early Stars*² is a well-written novel, and the opening chapters dealing with the hero's boyhood are decidedly interesting. But Mr. Kinross ceases to be natural when he describes Phil, as a literary tyro, sacrificing the artistic ideal to his love for Helen. The character of the successful novelist Lapraik is feebly portrayed. Indeed, the entire story falls off after the conclusion of the first part. The conception of Helen as a hollow worldling, who deceives Phil for years, is quite forced, and there is about all the work, so far as it professes to deal with "the tender passion," an atmosphere of utter unreality. Mr. Kinross is a young writer. He should "try again," and should take for the hero of his next novel a soldier, a sailor, a lawyer, a physician, a navvy—anything but a literary man. It is as dangerous to write "shop" as to talk "shop."

The edition of the *Medea*³ of Euripides, by Messrs. Thompson and Mills, will enable the student to understand and appreciate a tragedy which in the introduction is rightly described as "One of Euripides' masterpieces." The notes give very lucid explanations of the text, and special attention is paid to grammatical difficulties. The editors have evidently spared no pains in order to make the work useful to students of Greek literature.

¹ *Cricket Stories, Wise and Otherwise.* Gathered by C. W. Alcock. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

² *The Early Stars.* By Albert Kinross. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

³ *Euripides: Medea.* Edited by John Thompson, M.A. Camb. and J. R. Mills, M.A. Oxon. London: W. B. Clive.

POETRY.

*The Couper Anthology*¹ is not quite an ideal selection of poems representative of the period of English poetry ranging from 1775 to 1800. A great number of Burns' poems are given, and perhaps justly; but the specimens of Wordsworth's poetry are not the best that might have been given. Why is the "Ode on Intimations of Immortality" omitted? The whole of Coleridge's "Ancient Mariner" and "Christabel" are given; and to this no admirer of England's greatest poets and thinkers can object. Hayley's vapid poem, "Little Tom the Sailor," certainly does not enhance the literary value of the volume. However, Professor Arber had a difficult task, and he has discharged it fairly well.

Signor Carlo Cozzi sings enthusiastically about the beauties of the city loved by Byron and Shelley in his delightful *Sonetti di Venezia*.² The Italian language is rich in musical sounds, and is, therefore, a splendid instrument in the hands of a poet. Petrarch's sonnets have won immortality, and there appears to be no reason for hoping that Signor Cozzi's beautiful verses may not outlive brass and marble.

Science has become such a tremendous factor in the intellectual life of our time that it must have its poet. Scientific research may seem dry and laborious, but the gigantic results of such research open up a golden vista to the imagination. Mlle. Fridolin Werm, in her beautiful poem addressed to Herbert Spencer, and in *Paroles de 1900*³ shows that she can give eloquent expression to the poetic side of science. Not in blind faith, but in the glorious hopes of the future, does she find support and consolation. Here is a fine passage in the poem addressed to Herbert Spencer:

"Esperons: L'homme est grand même dans la faiblesse,
Il apprend à mener Forces et Matière en laisse,
Remorquant la Nature. Elle a beau bougonner,
Par des trucs de Protée effrayer, étonner,
L'homme ne peut un peu s'empêcher de sourire,
Quand, le poing sur le gorge, il l'oblige à lui dire."

How much better does this put the truth as to the triumphs of science than Mr. Swinburne does in his sublimely childish refrain:

"Glory to man in the highest! for man is the master of things."

¹ *The Couper Anthology* (A.D. 1775-1780). Edited by Professor Edward Arber, F.S.A. London: Henry Frowde.

² *Sonetti di Venezia*. By Carlo Cozzi, Verona: Fratelli Drukker (Libreria alla Minerva). Padova: Libreria all' Università.

³ *A Herbert Spencer*. Par Fridolin Werm. Paris: Schleicher Frère.

⁴ *Paroles de 1900*. Par Fridolin Werm. Paris: A. Charles.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLVI. No. 3.—SEPTEMBER 1901.

IMPERIALISM, AND THE COMING CRISIS FOR DEMOCRACY.

THE more intelligent of the Imperialist war-party appear to consider themselves aggrieved by the tone of a good deal of the criticism to which they have been subjected of late, since it would seem to suggest that all Imperialists must necessarily be knaves, fools, or ignoramuses. Such intention has been, generally speaking, far from the minds of most of the critics. But I have frequently heard this complaint from some who are, to their credit, more than half ashamed of the practices to which their principles have lately committed them in Africa and Asia. Whilst approving of the South African and other wars of expansion, these advocates of a "higher" Imperialism warmly repudiate any sympathy with the financial schemes of Mr. Cecil Rhodes and his associates, who, at the same time, they cannot deny have been very largely, if not wholly, responsible for the violent turn events have taken. They resent indignantly any imputations which may seem calculated to besmirch the purity of their Imperialist ideal. But they cannot escape the fact, however honourable and admirable their own intentions may be, that they are giving countenance and support to precisely those elements which they readily join in condemning, and therefore they are allowing their ideal to be dragged in the dirt at the chariot-wheels of an all-triumphant Mammonism; they are conniving at its degradation, and therefore cannot justly complain if it be defiled. If they delude themselves in the belief that its condition is not such as is unavoidable under the circumstances, they cannot expect others to share the same delusion. At any rate, those who have been principally concerned

in arousing warlike emotions among us for their own purposes, and to whom must naturally accrue the financial advantages of the South African war, are not thus misled. A perusal of the speeches, &c., made at the meetings of the various companies and elsewhere show very clearly that the principal object they have in view is increased dividends, to be obtained by the employment of cheap black and yellow labour, directed on a plan not far removed from absolute slavery, in place of white, and by the abolition of various restrictions which prevented them from carrying out these and other schemes for the more effectual exploitation of the territories involved. These gentlemen, with whose cynically frank utterances most people are by this time acquainted, knew precisely what they were talking about; which is equivalent to saying that those who give to the war in South Africa any other interpretation than is thus indicated do not. Like all other wars in our times, it was simply a result of the growth of the capitalist system which, in this case, received an unwonted stimulus from the discovery of gold; and hostilities were precipitated through the inability of the slow-moving and conservative Government of the Transvaal to respond at a moment's notice to the sudden demands made upon it by the capitalists. It is, of course, unquestionable that this expansion will continue until its possibilities are exhausted. But when the limits are reached must come a reaction, when all the consequences, good or evil, will be visited upon those responsible for them. In the unbroken sequence of cause and effect, nations, as individuals, inevitably reap as they have sown. This is no mere abstract apothegm; it is a concrete fact illustrated throughout history, and a matter of everyday experience. As Professor Froude has said: 'Justice and truth alone endure and live. Injustice and falsehood may be long-lived, but doomsday comes at last to them in French revolutions and other terrible ways.'¹ And those who have followed the course of the South African war, and observed the manner in which its prosecution has been advocated by the capitalist press, cannot but be aware that injustice and falsehood could scarcely have gone to greater lengths. It behoves us, therefore, to consider what the mission of our civilisation really is, to study its objects and its methods, and to realise its effects upon the less developed communities which come under its influence. If we discover that its tendencies are not such as our best judgment can commend to our ethical consciousness, it becomes our duty, not only as citizens of any one country, but as humanitarians in the widest sense, to do our best to check these tendencies and to awaken those around us to an understanding of the inevitable consequences of a persistence in morally perverted courses.

Though we may repudiate that kind of political inevitability of

¹ Lecture on the "Science of History."

which we have recently heard so much as amounting to simply a helpless fatalism, nevertheless there is an inevitable force or law—a destiny, if one choose—which compels nations to advance, whether the units composing them will or no; it is the same force that was behind all evolutionary processes in geological time working forward to an unknown end in the social organism. But there is a considerable difference in the action of this force in its more extended and complex applications. Then, the method was simple. A given type of organism found the conditions under which it attained its full development changing, its sphere of activity growing more and more restricted; either that organism adapted itself to the changed conditions or it became extinct. Once the fittest to survive, it had to give place to other types which were better adapted to the new environment, though previously they might not have been able to exist a single day. Then, all life-forms were mere creatures of fortuitous circumstances; the law of evolution called them into existence and blotted them out again, acting in a manner absolutely apart from their own volition or desire. The same process continues in the evolution of the social organism.

Such, I take it, is the line of argument whereby the “scientific” advocates of the “higher” Imperialism justify violent aggression by the more advanced organisms upon others more backward which they may choose to regard as “unfitted to survive” in the social struggle for existence. But it is necessary to point out the important oversight that all, or nearly all, advocates of the evolutionary theory of social progress constantly commit. The units (may I say “molecules”?) composing the evolving organism—human society—are themselves highly organised, are capable of apprehending the process going on around them, and of comprehending the general law controlling it. They are therefore able to “put themselves in line,” as it were, with evolution, so as to avoid the suffering and inconvenience which invariably accompany ignorance or sheer fatalistic resignation to a power presumably beyond control. There is, in short, an intellectual perception in these matters, together with a moral consciousness, in man, which was, and is, largely absent in the lower physical organisms. It is by virtue of this perception and this consciousness that social evolution may be made a process uniting the greatest efficiency with absolute social harmony and individual well-being. Unfortunately, both the perception and the consciousness are entirely wanting in those who, because of various personal or national interests, set themselves in opposition to the most absolutely irresistible power in the universe; the result being that they and the interests they would defend are, sooner or later, involved in one common ruin, and swept away as completely as a child’s sand-castle is demolished by the rising tide, the extent of the

upheaval being in ratio to the strength of the opposition. It is in this respect that President Kruger and his advisers (whose policy in many ways deserved the condemnation of all progressive thinkers) are responsible for the desolation of their countries; but the fact that they gave way so far as to lead Sir Alfred Milner to declare their concessions to be "as liberal as anything I was prepared to suggest,"¹ entirely exonerates them from the charge of *sole* responsibility. And the consciousness, if not the perception, is equally wanting in those who look forward to and prepare for such disaster for the purposes of personal enrichment; very often, as we have seen in South Africa, endeavouring to increase the opposition that the wreckage may be more complete. For, when we consider the further and, it may be added, unreasonable demands that were made upon the Transvaal subsequent to the concessions just referred to and the avoidance of arbitration so repeatedly asked for, we are forced to the conclusion that war, rather than peace, was desired by those who conducted the negotiations on our side, and to account on these grounds for the undoubted "sharp practice" which characterised their diplomacy all through. But the outlook of those who, possessing both the perception of general tendencies and moral consciousness, do not rise superior to the merely animal selfishness which actuates these two classes of persons, cannot be called that of philosophy, neither can it be so dignified if they allow themselves to be swayed by the personal, class, or "patriotic" bias which, unfortunately, dominate the minds of the vast majority of people.

Taking our stand, then, upon a position which looks down on all personal and class interests as futile as a child's castle on the seashore, which regards the struggles of mere partisanship, whether or not dignified by that much-abused term "patriotism," in the same light as the feuds with which the young roughs of rival districts occasionally disturb our towns, and which classes all those people of low moral development, who seek personal gain by others' loss, together in one common category, whether stock-exchange speculators, gamblers, company-promoters, wreckers, burglars, confidence-tricksters, and the like "men-slugs and human serpentry" who fatten on the corruption which gives rise to their existence, we are able to take a wider and clearer view of what Imperialism is to day, and to realise the crisis towards which it is rapidly hastening our civilisation.

In order to arrive at a correct understanding of those processes of national expansion which are comprehended by the policy of Imperialism, it is necessary to bear in mind the fact that this, as all other policies, has as its first consideration the interests of the economically dominant classes of society.

¹ Blue-Book, c. 9521, p. 62.

If we may regard the aggressions of primitive tribes upon one another, where the whole population, men, women and children, of the vanquished were either slain or enslaved, and their property confiscated by the conquerors, as the budding-out, as it were, of the Imperialist idea, then it had its origin in naked plunder without any of the redeeming features or compensating advantages which usually accompanied the encroachments of civilised communities upon their less advanced and weaker neighbours. In these later times, though the process was one of mitigated robbery whereby the revenues of the dominant and "owning" classes were further increased, the acquirement of fame and the ideal of national glory elevated the policy of aggression above the sheer brutality of insensate greed. But neither these romantic objects nor the still more delusive motive of religious zeal can disguise from the scientific investigator the real economic causes which underlie all human activities, generally without the conscious knowledge of the actors themselves.

In all pre-capitalist societies, where the dominant classes had no direct concern with the industry, trade or commerce of their respective countries, but were enabled to derive revenues from the institutions of slavery or serfdom, their policies of foreign conquest were capable of being elevated into ideals much more noble than those of the modern capitalist state, where the Stock Exchange has greater influence in shaping such policies than the grandest council of kings, princes and nobles. Where the latter might consider a succession of splendid military triumphs, accompanied by a long and brilliant record of personal adventures and deeds in arms, rounded off by the acquirement of extended political power, as of prime importance, the former would have no thought above the increased values of stocks and shares.

Though the desire of obtaining political power for its own sake was the conscious incentive of all the wars in which the feudal nobles, and before them the dominant classes of the slave societies, delighted to indulge, such power must necessarily have been barren unless accompanied by some substantial return in the way of increased revenues. Hence it is unlikely that any of these wars were undertaken without the possibilities of material gain being first considered. Even such mad enterprises as the Crusades, when subjected to the cold analysis of economic science, appear no longer as the results of religious exaltation. The feudal system having developed to its fullest possibilities throughout Europe, internecine warfare was there found to diminish, rather than to augment, the revenues of the dominant classes. Thus they were reduced to a temporary inaction from their principal employment—arms. It was with them, as with our modern capitalists, who, having exploited their own countries to the utmost, and being unable to find immediate investment for their capital, seek employment for it further afield,

when, if unsuccessful, they are apt to yield to and encourage the wildest speculative schemes which, under normal conditions, they would never have countenanced. The later events among the states founded by the Crusaders in Asia on feudal principles show very clearly that it was simply the transference of the leading characteristics of feudalism to localities where they might find freer expression, to the advantage, and not the loss, of the dominant classes. The freeing of the "Holy Sepulchre" was the pretext, in the same way as the "franchise" was the leading pretence for war with the Transvaal, and was, no doubt, thoroughly believed to be the sole motive by the majority of those who supported the enterprise. But with the development of the capitalist system throughout Europe came a complete change in the economic conditions, and, as feudalism died, faded those ideals which added a certain redeeming dignity and picturesqueness to a state of society revolting in many ways to all modern sense of humanity. This loss is certainly not the gain of capitalism whose aggressive policies our politicians, rhymesters and religionists vainly strive to invest with such ideals as the "spread of civilisation," "burden of empire," "mission of Christianity," and the like, with very poor success, if their latest efforts in this direction are the best they are capable of. The fact is, in a purely commercial age, it becomes impossible to disguise the objects for which such enterprises are undertaken.

It is only reasonable to allow that, in the ages of romance and chivalry, the nobility really imagined themselves inspired by higher purposes than the mere desire of gain. At all times, indeed, it has been the custom of the dominant and proprietary classes to delude themselves in the belief that the interests of society at large were inseparable from their own; that they, in short, constituted the state, and therefore the governing and administrative power pertained by "right divine" to themselves. The effects of this subordination of the popular welfare to private interests being naturally the same in the social, as in the physical organism, when one group of cells attains abnormal development at the expense of the rest—a diseased condition of the whole, culminating in collapse, demise and disintegration. No doubt those eminent Romans who took the oath to be the "eternal enemies of the people" believed themselves actuated by motives highly conducive to the permanent stability of their society; but however that might have been, at any rate they had none of the gross and inexcusable hypocrisy of the modern Christian philanthropist of the Lord Overton type, who derives his means of spreading the "Gospel," which is supposed to make for general peace and prosperity, from the overwork of his employes under worse than merely insanitary conditions.¹ History shows how great is the

¹ See the recent exposure of the Shawfield Chemical Works in the *Labour Leader* "White Slave Series," No. 3 and 4.

delusion underlying this sacrificing of the commonwealth to class interests. As an historian (Vico) has remarked: "When we ask ourselves what real service Curtius, Decius and Fabricius rendered the unhappy Roman populace, we are forced to admit that they only added to the existing misery by plunging the people into wars and sinking them into an ocean of usury," with revolution as the result, and finally the break-up of the system. In the same way the nobility, by their increasing tyrannies and extortions, alienated the popular sympathies, and still more so by their unrestrained rapacity which led them to the plundering of the Church; thus contributing to the decline of feudalism, and hastening on the industrial revolution which established the capitalist system in its place, and advanced the *bourgeoisie* from their subordinate condition as master-handicraftsmen and simple traders to their present position of plutocratic predominance. These, in their turn, by sacrificing all other interests to dividends and profit-making, are busily engaged in widening the gulf between capital and labour; the rise of each new millionaire, and the elevation of these again into that essentially modern product, the "multi-millionaire," giving an additional acuteness to the "class-war," which will eventually destroy the system. And, however convincingly their retainers in the press and elsewhere may argue that this enrichment of the few at the expense of the many is conducive of the general welfare, the sophistry will become more and more apparent as the process is observed to work itself out in precisely the opposite direction. But it would be neither reasonable nor fair to suppose that those who shape the policies of modern states really entertain any such fallacious ideas themselves. It would not be doing justice to the intelligence of our plutocrats to accept their declarations of philanthropic intention when they appeal to their respective countries (or to the countries which serve their purpose best at the time, capitalism being cosmopolitan) to wage expensive wars, for which they will be taxed for generations, on behalf of bond-holders in Egypt, tobacco and sugar-planters in Cuba and the Philippine Islands, or of mining-syndicates in South Africa. Indeed, the now famous saying attributed to Mr. Cecil Rhodes: "We are not going to war for the amusement of royal families, as in the past, we mean practical business," might fittingly be embroidered on all the military standards of Europe. By "we" is, of course, meant that international association of capitalists in whose interests are directed the home and foreign policies of the various governments whose nominal figure-heads, the "royal families," are merely so many marionettes that dance before the peoples to the playing of the capitalist lute. Even the seemingly all-powerful German Kaiser has to shape, if not his words, at any rate his actions, in accordance with the policy of German capitalists co-operating with their *confrères* of other countries. If the "mailed

fist" were not a convenient tool to use in the opening-up of China, it might be clenched but it would never strike. Its owner might, in the words of our James I., assure the world that, "Kings are justly called gods, for that they exercise a manner or resemblance of divine power upon earth; for if you will consider the attributes of God, you shall see how they agree in the person of a king." But he would find, as James discovered, that not even Omnipotence itself could tax currents and broadcloth with impunity! It is interesting to observe, in this connection, the change of attitude, if not of sentiment, on the part of the German Emperor towards President Kruger. If any intervention is needed in South Africa on behalf of international capitalism, it will be France, with her more powerful navy and the probable support of Russia, who will undertake the task, and whose interest has already been enlisted for the purpose. The work of Germany, as a land power, lies in another direction.

In the past, the peoples were the playthings of kings and nobles "for their amusement"; to-day they are the pawns of the plutocracy, and the "royal families" themselves but major pieces in the game of world-wide exploitation for "practical business" purposes. Beyond this, nothing. All that is said and written with respect to the influence of civilisation upon less advanced peoples, and the mission of Christianity to the heathen is, to speak plainly, sheer hypocrisy. When the possibilities of exploitation at home are exhausted it becomes necessary for the system to extend its sphere of activity in order that the surplus capital may be more profitably employed. As Senator Depew explained it in a recent speech at Philadelphia (U.S.A.): "Why this knocking at the door of Peking? Why are our armies marching over Asia? Is it because the surplus of products is greater than civilised countries can consume?" This extension being in the nature of the capitalist system which, by restricting the consuming powers of the masses by paying wage-labour so much less than the value of its product, and by allowing the surplus to pass into the private possession of the capitalist classes, finds itself every now and again overburdened by its wealth either in the form of commodities for immediate consumption or as capital for investment. This must find an outlet abroad since it can be no longer disposed of profitably at home. Hence the policy of capitalist Imperialism.

An examination into the effects of capitalist expansion upon the countries brought under its control discovers, as the results of the drying-up of their resources, material impoverishment and moral degeneration, together with a general tendency to racial extinction. To the natives of Asia, as well as the aborigines of Africa, America, Australasia and the Pacific Islands, the "blessings of civilisation" must seem very much in disguise when we consider

the atrocities everywhere committed against the unfortunate people that come under their influence.

Lord Salisbury's remark, "India must be bled," expressed in four words the whole *raison d'être* of our Indian Empire—and the true errand of all military enterprises under capitalism. For this purpose are the armies of Europe and the United States being directed against China. It remains to be seen if she will submit as patiently to the process, or whether she will follow the example of Japan, in which latter case Western society itself will undergo some very drastic surgical operations which will change the whole form of its economic organisation.

When we come to consider the effects of this Imperialism at home, we are more at a loss than ever to discover its benefits to humanity. We find Europe taxed to the utmost to support a burden of armaments useless to all save the few who profit by them; their object being, not to increase or defend the liberties of those who bear the cost, but to keep them in subjection; to be used only in driving new channels through which the capitalists may pour their surplus with profit to themselves; or to be directed against any nation hindering the free play of capitalist enterprise, or that may be guilty of any temporary aberration such as making them pay for their own warlike expeditions. In these two latter respects we have many clear illustrations of the anti-patriotic sentiments of capitalism; as when the capitalists of Austria in 1848, finding themselves unduly hampered by the landed aristocracy, invited Prussia to invade and conquer the country; and, again, when Sir Michael Hicks-Beach proposed to lay the cost of the South African war upon the goldfields, the companies placed hundreds of thousands of pounds' worth of shares on the Continental market, with the result that a committee "of great political importance" was formed in Paris "to provoke the intervention of the French Government directly the shareholders' interests were attacked." So, when Sir Michael finally introduced his Budget, he "plainly intimated that this source (the goldfields) was no longer to be looked to for relief by the burdened taxpayer at home."¹ So much for the "mission of civilisation" abroad, and the "patriotism" that inspires it at home. We may, indeed, question its influence here, when we see the poor, dingy, demented mobs of people, creeping out of their shabby-genteel houses, and from the dens and kennels of the slums, to rejoice about they know not what in an orgie which frightened even the Imperialist press, to whom it was directly due, into what seemed, at first sight, some very ludicrous and illogical comments. But "patriotism" has served the purpose of the capitalists, and is now called "brutality," a change of front quite in keeping with the cynical contempt with

¹ See *Times* report of the meeting of the Consolidated Goldfields Company on November 14, 1899. Also *Pull Mall Gazette* of February 19 and letter of M. Ernest A. Visetelly in *Westminster Gazette*, March 9, 1900.

which the plutocracy regards the "swinish multitude," against whom they would not hesitate to direct the forces of the empire, whether white troops or coloured,¹ with the same thoroughness in the way of slaughter and extermination as against the Boers, the Soudanese, or the Chinese, if the masses dared to stand up and claim their just rights as free citizens to a fairer share in the possession of their own country and the wealth they produce. For our dominant classes know very well that their concern is not the spread of civilisation, nor the alleged mission of civilisation, nor anything else but the preservation and advancement of their own economic interests at the cost of the subject peoples of the world.

Realising the absolutely anti-patriotic nature of cosmopolitan capitalism which sells from England, Germany, France and America, arms and ammunition to be used indiscriminately in the slaughter of English, German, French and American troops who may be directed against each other, or against an "uncivilised" foe, armed and equipped by their own countrymen, in the furthering of plutocratic interests, we cannot help smiling cynically on reading the sentimental appeals of the press to the patriotism of these various countries. We must, however, beware of invidious moralising in this respect. The too-sentimental humanitarian, carried away by his emotions, is apt to overlook the important fact that all these apparently injurious and dangerous tendencies are the logical and natural results of the capitalist *régime* working forward to its culmination. Such men as Mr. Cecil Rhodes and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain are, after all that has been, or may be, said of them, but personifications, as it were, of certain natural economic forces which must find an expression—if not through them, then through others. Fitted by temperament, by education, by environment, and by circumstances predestined, as it were, to carry out a certain work, they cannot but obey their dominant impulses. Hence, however useful, or even necessary, it may be to point to the embodiment of a principle—to this, that, or the other person who is chiefly instrumental in reducing it to practice—the injuriousness of which we wish to demonstrate, we must be careful lest we commit an injustice by applying or construing such personalities too literally. It is, however, much to be regretted that our plutocrats do not take a more far-sighted view of the probable ultimate results of their policies. The idea that all is not as well as it might be with society, even from the capitalist point of view, and the feeling of uneasiness consequent upon it, appears to be very prevalent, judging from the tone of many of the articles which from time to time appear in the reviews and newspapers, especially those devoted to trade and finance. Further, the

¹ As the capitalists of America used blacks to suppress the white miners of Idaho, so our own moneyed classes might easily fall back upon Goorkhas, Sikhs, or Hausas, if uncertain whether the "loyalty" of the English regiments would carry them so far as to shoot down their own kith and kin.

absence of adequate reply to such as take a pessimistic view of the future, and the increasing frequency with which we hear the remark, "It will last our time," in place of any reply at all, go to show a weakening of the system whereupon our modern civilisation is based. It is by no means certain that it will "last our time." There is, on the contrary, strong reason for believing that the crisis to which our present transition period is rapidly bringing us, is much nearer than is generally supposed.

Capitalism, by reason of its peculiar economy, can only exist so long as it is able to keep on opening-up new markets for the disposal of its surplus products. When a limit is reached it must collapse through the vitiation of its economic system. Already competition at home, in England and America, has arrived at the end of its possibilities, and, as a consequence, vigorous attempts are being made to consolidate as many previously competing interests as possible, and a new economic factor is being evolved in the trusts. Competition between the Western nations is also beginning to give place to an internationalism that is making patriotism a more or less obsolete sentiment. And, with each new market opened-up elsewhere, are eventually established fresh competitors, some of whom, Japan and China for example, may prove formidable enough to give a finishing blow to the industrial supremacy of the West. This consideration leads a writer in a recent number of the *Contemporary Review*¹ to surmise the establishment of self-supporting communities in face of the threatening "Yellow Peril." It may be so; but the social effect of the economic transformation will be very different from that which he prophesies for England—the reducing of the vast, industrial, wage-earning population to the position of servants ministering to the pleasures of the rich—even though we be not a democratic people. There can be no doubt, however, that "the serious decline of England as an industrial centre has begun," and that the old "workshop of the world" dream of the Manchester school will never be realised. The extent to which manufacturing and other capitalist interests are being transferred to America has been recently described in the interesting despatches of the New York *Sun's* London correspondent. But it is questionable whether the trades union difficulty has so much to do with creating the situation as he would make out, and it is certain that the contemplated attempt to break up the unions would result, not in destroying labour combinations, but in driving the workers into a more extreme, and, from the capitalist point of view, more dangerous organisation. The fact is that in England, where the system primarily established itself, the decadent tendencies are first beginning to manifest themselves. Competitive capitalism is rapidly coming to a deadlock, and the industrial supremacy of America, or Germany, or any other nation, if attained, cannot be

¹ William Clarke, article on "The Social Future of England," Dec. 1900.

long-lived, even if the "Yellow Péril" do not develop to the extent prophesied in some quarters. The restrictions placed upon the consuming powers of the masses, resulting in the recurring periods of "over-production" with which we are all familiar, must finally lead to a crisis from which there can be no relief save by a change of economic system involving social reconstruction. There can then be no question of the "rich" turning the "poor" into servitors in the sense conveyed by the *Contemporary Review* writer, for they will find their sources of wealth spontaneously dried up. The capitalist will be restricted more and more to his own home markets for the disposal of his commodities, and this he will be unable to do at a profit, since the people (whose effective demand constitutes the home market) are utterly unable to buy back even a half of the values they create. Hence the "profit system" must come to an end, and with it will conclude the economic predominance of our plutocratic classes. There will finally offer but two solutions of the difficulty. Either the system will begin to prey upon itself, and our civilisation will collapse as many another has done before it; or the proletaire will gain the economic ascendancy, and with it political supremacy.

A writer in the November issue of *Blackwood*, under the heading, *Musings without Method*, after showing at some length, and with much force of argument, what a fraud our present-day system of "popular representation" really is, observes: "So the democracy has proved a sham, and its failure is the country's triumph." The very obvious self-contradiction contained in this remark (which is tantamount to saying that the people's failure is the nation's triumph), since it proceeds from the class-delusion before dealt with, need not concern us; but, taken together with the very true and apposite observation: "Our government is to-day what it has always been, an oligarchy hedged about with safeguards," shows the unwisdom of "musing without method." As a matter of fact, democracy is neither a success nor a failure, simply because it has never yet been tried, and cannot be tried until the decomposition of the present system shall have sufficiently weakened the political power of the plutocratic "oligarchy." The political system of any given social-order is simply the expression of its economic form, and when the latter changes a corresponding transformation occurs in the former. This fact cannot escape notice by the careful student of history who conducts his researches in the light of economic science. The question of democracy, like that of plutocracy or aristocracy, is one of social evolution, and not of the passing political phases incidental to the process. So long as the economic bases of feudalism, or capitalism, or the slave-societies which preceded them, remained sound, so long was it impossible for any essential political change to occur in those systems. We may, if we choose, describe the governments of England, France and

America as "democratic," in view of the suffrage, but, if we believe them to be so, we are mistaken. There can be no possibility of a really democratic administration where class-monopoly in the land and capital of the community exists, for political power invariably accompanies control of the revenues. Democracy is, therefore, impossible so long as the economic conditions of society allow of such monopoly. But these conditions are rapidly changing, and the decomposition of the present system which is going on under our very eyes, obvious enough even to the most careless observer, is facilitating the political expression of those tendencies towards the new system which will succeed it, and which will render capitalist, or plutocratic, monopoly impossible. When this transformation is complete, democracy will be established, and not before.

It is much to be regretted that, in connection with the concentration of industry as foreshadowed in the trusts, and the increasing tendencies towards municipalisation, the subject of social-democracy (that is, democracy considered in its completest form, together with all the social effects, moral, intellectual and political, which will, or may, flow from its economic basis) is not more seriously considered, especially as this essentially proletarian school of thought regards these two processes as exemplifying the embryonic formation of the new system it advocates. The utter silence of the press, and what is worse, the extremely ill-informed criticisms by what profess to be carefully thought-out treatises on the subject, show how very little it is appreciated or understood by what are known as the "educated" classes. Yet, with the development of capitalism has proceeded the growth of this movement which probably numbers a larger number of adherents throughout the civilised world than any other single political party. To its purely destructive criticism there can be no adequate reply; whilst in its constructive ideal it presents features that cannot fail to powerfully impress and control the more seriously inclined and thoughtful of the proletariat, and those of the professional and "middle" classes who are beginning to feel the increasing stress of the present system. And, whatever may be said of the theories of the earlier "utopian" socialists, or of some of the half-considered crudities which are occasionally paraded to-day under the name of socialism, there can be no doubt that, in its broad and general outlines, this doctrine describes in no uncertain terms the nature of the social order that will succeed the present.

Among the *Musings without Method* above quoted occurs a remark that might serve as a most appropriate motto for the democracy of the future: "Nobody can be trusted to govern us unless he has first passed through a fiery ordeal." The capitalist classes passed through such an ordeal at the hands of the feudal nobility, and by it attained that mental and moral superiority which established

their system. They, in turn, have provided an ordeal through which the democracy is now passing. Indeed, but for this ordeal and the lessons accompanying it further progress would have been impossible. After all that may be said of capitalism in its present decadent and degenerate days, when its evils are growing greater than its benefits, it has, nevertheless, rendered invaluable service to humanity. By increasing enormously the productivity of applied human energy—labour—it has proved that poverty is no longer a necessary human condition; by its organisation of the division of labour, it has placed interdependence in place of independence; by its effective handling of vast masses of capital, it has shown the manner in which a nation may administer its own resources; by its perfection of the machinery of distribution and exchange, it has indicated the method whereby the national wealth may be more widely and evenly diffused; and, lastly, and most important of all, it has, for the first time in human history, opened out to mankind a clear view of that splendid dream which has ever possessed the minds of the greatest thinkers of the race—the Brotherhood of Humanity. It is here that the significance of international democracy becomes most apparent. As an Imperialism it is much more decided than cosmopolitan capitalism, for it aims at nothing less than world-wide dominion; but, instead of playing off the peoples against each other, it urges them to combine in one common bond against the tyranny of the last of all class-dominations—the plutocratic oligarchy. The democratic idea of progressive civilisation is to advance the welfare of all peoples alike, not at the expense of each other, but by means of peaceful co-operation on the basis of international interdependence and good-will. Before this gigantic ideal of international democracy the petty schemes of exploitive capitalism appear dwarfed into insignificance. And, as the ill effects of the latter continue to manifest themselves more acutely, it will come to be less approved of, despite the efforts of the “patriotic” press to credit it with advantages only obvious to the few who continue to profit by it. With the decadence of the present system the democratic movement will gain strength enough to establish its economic basis, and, as it does this, the political power will fall more and more into its hands. The frantic efforts of our dominant classes to consolidate their interests and to perpetuate their class-predominance by the suppression of labour organisations, or by the establishment of “stronger” governments against the increasing demands of the masses, will teach the latter the wisdom they sadly need. Finally, the enormous wealth of the plutocracy is no longer the result of their own individual enterprise and endeavour, but proceeds from an alleged “right” to appropriate to their private use the profits of the various national industries which at one time they directed personally, and which are now passing under the control of salaried managers and

officials, whilst an increasing number of the "capitalists" themselves know nothing whatever about the conduct of their own businesses. Thus are they losing that intellectual power which justified their class-dominance in the past. And by their increasing luxuriousness and indolence, and the cynical selfishness that leads them constantly to sacrifice all national and social interests to their own advantage, they are degenerating morally as well as mentally. In this degeneration, which would leave them helpless and panic-stricken in face of anything like a national or international strike, lies the opportunity of the democracy to seize upon the reins of government dropped from their nerveless hands. A really "strong" government is no longer a possibility for them, since the economic basis of capitalism is decadent, and, unless this basis be of the soundest, political supremacy cannot long be maintained.

Thus it is, as the feudal system faded away before the supersession of capitalism, so capitalism is falling into decrepitude, to be succeeded by—What? Upon our answer to this question depends the future of the human race; whether, in the ebb and flow of evolution, society shall sink back into a state of anarchy and barbarism, to be followed by the slow upgrowth of the new system out of the ruins of the old; or whether the upward tendencies everywhere observable among the many reactionary processes significant of decay shall be consciously stimulated so as to effect the change with as little social disturbance as possible during the present century. These alternatives are presented to the consideration of those well-meaning Imperialists previously alluded to. A little unbiassed thought should convince them that, in giving their support to modern capitalist Imperialism, they are helping to bring about, not only the elimination of backward and unprogressive communities, but the collapse of their own civilisation by encouraging such reversions to barbarism as we have recently witnessed in connection with the wars in China, South Africa, and elsewhere, and which are but a consequence of the culmination of the capitalist system, when it must shortly begin to prey upon itself. Then will come the time when, by reason of its vitiated economic condition, it must collapse if subjected to any internal or external pressure.

If, therefore, we possess the intellectual perception of social tendencies and the consciousness that should enable us to discriminate between the moral and the immoral, the humane and the inhuman, and if we are true to our convictions, we shall divest ourselves of those narrow prejudices which cannot but render our efforts immediately productive of social discord and finally non-effective in the establishment of any good thing for humanity. Indeed, we shall not hesitate to pronounce all those persons, whether well-intentioned or not, who give pre-eminence to personal, class, party, or national interests in decided terms, enemies of society. For there can be

no doubt that these tendencies, if persisted in, must inevitably lead to social catastrophe culminating in anarchy of the worst description. It behoves us, therefore, to repudiate the specious Imperialism of the day and apply ourselves to the necessary work of social reform and ethical propaganda in the direction of an enlightened democracy, such as shall carry the world forward to those higher standards of life and manners and thought which will regard the events of the nineteenth and opening years of the twentieth centuries as the last struggles of mankind out of the ages-long night of groping barbarism to the broad day of a truly illuminated, world-wide civilisation.

JOHN E. ELLAM.

THE PRINCIPLES OF GLADSTONE'S FOREIGN POLICY.

WHILE it is well to expose the folly, not to say the criminality of the aggressive Imperialism now so rampant in our midst, it is surely of equal, if not of greater, importance to present a clear and practicable alternative to it. That such an alternative is to be found in the principles which guided the foreign policy of Liberalism, so far as that policy came under the control of the late Mr. Gladstone, it is now my purpose to show. There is nothing original in these principles. They are simply the maxims of ordinary moral conduct applied to politics. They derive no additional weight from the commanding personality of the man who adopted them. Like all sound principles, they are independent of authority. If we accept them we accept them on their own merits, and in so doing retain for ourselves the same freedom and independence as Gladstone himself retained.

It was his conviction that rules which bind individuals in the treatment of each other, are equally binding upon political communities when carrying on international intercourse. What it is wrong for you and I to do in our individual capacity, it is equally wrong for a million you's and I's to do in their collective capacity. The part of robber and pirate is as disgraceful in a nation as in an individual, and it has more than once brought in its train the most crushing humiliations. Gladstone instances the cases of Austria in Italy, of Turkey in Bulgaria, and of England herself in the thirteen colonies of America. These were just punishments for violations of the equal rights of other peoples to freedom and independence, and we may be very sure that we shall not have seen the last of them if we persist in the present policy of aggressive Imperialism. There are forces in the world fully adequate to deal with national piracy, though it may take time to rouse them into activity. When once roused, however, they will do their work and do it well.

But how unwise it is to let things come to this pass when a little consideration for the equal rights of others furnishes an honourable and peaceful means of avoiding it.

"Of all the principles of foreign policy," says Gladstone, "that to which I attach the greatest value is the principle of the equality of nations;
VOL. 156.—No. 3.

because, without recognising that principle, there is no such thing as public right, and without public international right there is no instrument available for settling the transactions of mankind except material force. Consequently the principle of equality among nations lies, in my opinion, at the very basis and root of a Christian civilisation, and when that principle is compromised or abandoned, with it must depart our hopes of tranquillity and progress for mankind" (*Third Midlothian Speech*, November 27, 1879).

It was because the last Tory Cabinet of Lord Beaconsfield ignored this principle that Gladstone re-entered political life for the purpose of overthrowing that Cabinet, and the splendid success that attended his efforts in this direction is now a matter of history. Powerful articles in the *Nineteenth Century*, pamphlets, postcards, letters in the press, eloquent speeches on platforms followed each other in rapid succession. There was no half-heartedness in Gladstone's opposition. "There was no cause," says Lord Rosebery, "so hopeless that he was afraid to undertake it. There was no amount of opposition that would cower him when once he had undertaken it." He went for the disciples of Saint Jingo like Ulysses went for the suitors of Penelope. Animated by the certainty of being in the right, he proved himself to be the strongest man in the England of that day, and so crippled the serpent of aggressive Imperialism that for twenty years afterwards it was unable to rear its head. For this he has been called a "Little Englander," but it still remains to be seen whether the term does not more truthfully describe his detractors. They think, or at least try to make their followers think, that the adoption of a threatening and aggressive policy towards other nations, or such among them as happen to be small and weak, and which they fancy will be easily conquered without much loss in blood or treasure, makes for the greatness of England. He thought that "to claim anything more than equality of rights in the moral and political intercourse of the world, is not the way to make England great, but to make it both morally and materially little." ("England's Mission," *Nineteenth Century*, September 1878, p. 569.) Time, which is the Eternal's testing process, will show with whom the truth lies. If deliberate violation of the rights of peoples and of nations, if tearing up with the sword the provisions of treaties solemnly agreed to at the time of their making, and repeatedly confirmed by the words of leading statesmen in both parties, can be indulged in by a nation with impunity; if there be no punishment to follow persistence in this unprincipled and dishonourable course, then indeed is the government of the world a rule of wrong: but we must be in no hurry to draw so disheartening a conclusion. Doing unto others what we would not like others to do unto us, brings about of itself its own punishment.

"It is very disagreeable," says Gladstone, "for an Englishman to hint to Englishmen that self-love and pride, which all condemn in individuals,

have often lured nations to their ruin and loss ; that they are apt to entail a great deal of meanness, as well as a great deal of violence ; that they begin with a forfeiture of respect abroad, and end even in the loss of self-respect ; that their effect is to destroy all sobriety in the estimation of human affairs, and to generate a temperament of excitability which errs alternately on the side of arrogance and of womanish and unworthy fears."

Violations of right, which minister with their territorial gains to national pride and greed, increase the violence of the very passions to which they minister ; and, inasmuch as it is in the very nature of passion, in proportion to its strength, to darken the reason of its victim, and prevent him from grasping the dangers of the path down which it drives him, it brings him eventually to a catastrophe as sudden and violent as it is unexpected. People call this the judgment of God. But in truth it is a necessary consequence of the nature of things. Nations no more than individuals can successfully serve two masters. If they will persist in serving Passion they must receive its wages. These wages are blindness, and loss consequent upon blindness. For it is passion, and nothing but passion, which leads nations, even as it leads individuals, to seek gain for themselves at the expense of loss to other nations. In vain Reason warns them that they are violating its moral law, by doing to others what they know that others, in similar circumstances, would have no right to do unto them. It only gets called a pro-Russian, a pro-Boer, or a traitor for its pains. The real traitors, however, the real enemies of their country, and of all countries, are those who put the service of passion before the service of Reason ; because they blind their countrymen to the truth, and eventually rouse up against them the outraged conscience of civilised mankind. Sooner or later they or their dupes, or both together, always reap as they sow.

Gladstone makes some wise remarks on this point :

"In the sphere of personal life," he says, "most men are misled through the medium of the dominant faculty of their nature. It is round that dominant faculty that folly and flattery are wont to buzz. They play upon vainglory by exaggerating and commending what it does, and by piquing it on what it sees cause to forbear from doing. It is so with nations. For all of them the supreme want really is, to be warned against the indulgence of the dominant passion."

He means "need." This kind of plain speaking is exactly what they do not "want."

"The dominant passion of France was military glory. Twice in this century it has towered beyond what is allowed to man ; and twice has paid the tremendous forfeit of opening to the foe the proudest capital in the world. The dominant passion of England is extended empire. It has heretofore been kept in check by the integrity of her statesmen, who have not shrunk from teaching her the lessons of self-denial and self-restraint. But a new race has arisen ; and the most essential or the noblest among

all the duties of government, the exercise of moral control over ambition and cupidity, have been left to the intermittent and feeble handling of those who do not govern."

This was written in 1878. It might have been written in 1901, so applicable is it to the state of things existing to-day. And equally applicable are the following observations taken from the same article :

"Not peace, not humanity, not reverence for the traditions established by the thought and care of the mighty dead, not anxiety to secure the equal rights of nations, not the golden rule to do to others as we would fain have them do to us, not farseeing provision for the future, have been the sources from which the present Ministers have drawn their strength" (*England's Mission*, p. 563).

In the third Midlothian speech Gladstone gives six principles of foreign policy for his country's acceptance :

"1. The first thing is to foster the strength of the Empire by just legislation and economy at home, thereby producing two of the great elements of national power -- namely, wealth, which is a physical element, and union and contentment, which are moral elements -- and to reserve the strength of the Empire, to reserve the expenditure of that strength for great and worthy occasions abroad. Here is my first principle of foreign policy : good government at home.

"2. My second principle of foreign policy is this : That its aim ought to be to preserve to the nations of the world -- and especially, were it but for shame, when we recollect the sacred name we bear as Christians, especially to the Christian nations of the world -- the blessings of peace. That is my second principle.

"3. My third principle is this : Even, gentlemen, when you do a good thing you may do it in so bad a way that you may entirely spoil the beneficial effect ; and if we were to make ourselves the apostles of peace in the sense of conveying to the minds of other nations that we thought ourselves more entitled to an opinion on that subject than they are, or to deny their rights -- well, very likely we should destroy the whole value of our doctrines. In my opinion, the third sound principle is this : To strive to cultivate and maintain, ay, to the very uttermost, what is called the Concert of Europe ; to keep the Powers of Europe in unison together. And why ? Because by keeping all in unison together you neutralise and fetter and bind up the selfish aims of each. I am not here to flatter either England or any of them. They have selfish aims, as, unfortunately, we in late years have too sadly shown that we too have had selfish aims ; but their common action is fatal to selfish aims. Common action means common objects ; and the only objects for which you can unite the Powers of Europe are objects connected with the common good of them all. That, gentlemen, is my third principle of foreign policy.

"4. My fourth principle is : That you should avoid needless and entangling engagements. You may boast about them, you may brag about them. You may say you are procuring consideration for the country. You may say that an Englishman can now hold up his head among the nations. You may say that he is not now in the hands of a Liberal Ministry, who thought of nothing but pounds, shillings and pence. But what does all this come to, gentlemen ? It comes to this, that you are increasing your engagements without increasing your strength ; and if you increase engagements without increasing strength, you diminish strength, you abolish

strength; you really reduce the Empire and do not increase it. You render it less capable of performing its duties; you render it an inheritance less precious to hand on to future generations.

"5. My fifth principle is this, gentlemen: To acknowledge the equal rights of all nations. You may sympathise with one nation more than another. Nay, you must sympathise in certain circumstances with one nation more than another. You sympathise most with those nations, as a rule, with which you have the closest connection in language, in blood, and in religion, or whose circumstances at the time seem to give the strongest claim to sympathy. But, in point of right, all are equal, and you have no right to set up a system under which one of them is to be placed under moral suspicion or espionage, or to be made the constant subject of invective. If you do that, but especially if you claim for yourself a superiority, a pharisaical superiority, over the whole of them, then I say you may talk about your patriotism, if you please, but you are a misjudging friend of your country, and, in undermining the basis of the esteem and respect of other people for your country, you are in reality inflicting the severest injury upon it.

"6. I have now given you, gentlemen, five principles of foreign policy. Let me give you a sixth, and then I have done. And that sixth is: That in my opinion foreign policy, subject to all the limitations that I have described, the foreign policy of England should always be inspired by the love of freedom. There should be a sympathy with freedom, a desire to give it scope, founded not upon visionary ideas, but upon the long experience of many generations within the shores of this happy isle, that in freedom you lay the firmest foundations both of loyalty and order; the firmest foundations for the development of individual character, and the best provision for the happiness of the nation at large."

The reader may be left to judge for himself as to whether the foregoing principles do or do not constitute a distinct alternative to the aggressive Imperialism of the present Salisbury and Chamberlain Government, even as they did to that of the Beaconsfield administration, against which they were employed during the now famous Midlothian campaign. Some of them will be found in other speeches, and the written presentations of them frequently occur in various contributions sent from time to time to periodical literature. The great central principle of the equal rights of all nations seems to have been first used by Gladstone in 1850 against Lord Palmerston's doctrine of *Civis Romanus Sum*, under cover of which that Minister sought to bully and intimidate Greece in the matter of the Don Pacifico claims. "No, sir," said Gladstone in the noble speech he made on this occasion; "no, sir, let us recognise, and recognise with frankness, the equality of the weak with the strong, the principle of brotherhood among nations, and of their sacred independence." He denounced Palmerston's doctrine to be the vain conception "that we, forsooth, have a mission to be the censors of the vice and folly, of the abuse and imperfection, of the other countries of the world." It was a bold stand for principle, a manly facing of unpopularity for the sake of truth and in defence of the weak against the strong; it was just like Gladstone all over, but it did not convince a majority of Englishmen in the House of Commons.

The infamous doctrine of "England right or wrong against the world" carried the day against him. "Mr. Gladstone's desire that England should be right made him many enemies among those Englishmen who desired only that she should be successful," was the shrewd remark of a writer in the *New York Tribune* at the time of the great statesman's death. In the world of international politics Gladstone was like a strong boy in a great public school, who uses his strength to protect the smaller and weaker boys from the bullies that usually infest such establishments. He seems to have been utterly devoid of the Englishman's sporting instinct, the instinct which causes that highly self-satisfied being to take a keen enjoyment in killing or destroying something; and it has been remarked by a thoughtful critic that if Gladstone could have been induced to be present at a fox-hunt, all his sympathies would have been with the fox. No wonder that so many of his countrymen should have hated him as they did. No wonder that almost immediately after his death they should give full rein to their brutal lust of slaughter, from which he laboured so long and so earnestly to restrain them. There is a remarkable utterance bearing upon this point, which appeared just at the time of the statesman's death, in the *Globe*, Madrid, the organ of Senor Castelar :

"Mr. Gladstone's decease," says a writer in this newspaper, "will cause mourning in all sincerely liberal hearts throughout the civilised world. He dies peacefully, conscious of always having done his duty and of having consecrated a long and fruitful life to the welfare of humanity and his country, though, perhaps, saddened by the conduct of the latter. . . . The policy of sentiment disappears with Gladstone, and the horrible policy of brute force takes its place. Mr. Gladstone has heard on his death-bed the echoes of the speeches of his unworthy rivals Salisbury and Chamberlain. With Mr. Gladstone dead, the scales of justice threaten to fall on the side of gold and iron, not on the side of reason."

This was written in May 1898, nearly a year after the leaders of the Liberal party surrendered their honour and independence into the hands of the Tory Government, by assisting that deceitful Government to suppress the truth as to who were the real conspirators in the diabolical plot to overthrow the South African Republic by bloodshed and murder in the latter half of 1895. Owing to this base betrayal on the part of the Liberals, the scales had already begun to fall on the side of gold and iron. Had they but done the right on that occasion, they would have totally altered the whole course of subsequent events. The fate of the Tory Government was then in their hands. By insisting on the sifting of that shameful business to the bottom, they would have driven the Government from power in dishonour. But, as has been well said, they sold the pass. Instead of doing their duty they went over like traitors to the enemy. This would not have occurred if Gladstone had been

at the head of the Liberal party. He would have made himself no consenting party to an elaborate conspiracy to suppress the truth and deceive the British public and foreign Governments. He would have forced the hands of Salisbury and Chamberlain. He would have crushed them under the weight of that moral power which he knew so well how to use. By this means he would have restored confidence to South Africa, and thus avoided a war which in all probability will ultimately lead to the destruction of British rule in that country. But then Gladstone was a statesman. The men who hushed up the truth concerning the South African conspiracy of 1895 are not statesmen. To truthfully describe what they are would possibly require language not permitted in our Imperial Parliament. By failing to do justice in that crucial matter they proved to the Dutch people in South Africa that neither of the two great political parties in England could be trusted to hold the balance even between the two white races living in that part of the world. It is this failure to act fair which has made the present war inevitable. Had either our leading Liberals or our leading Tories been in this matter actuated by "an ambition higher than that which looks for military triumph or for territorial aggrandisement"; had either party sought "to signalise itself by walking in the plain and simple ways of right and justice"; had either been animated by the desire "never to build up empire except in the happiness of the governed," which Gladstone claims to have been the case with his Government when dealing with the South African question in 1881, this war would never have taken place, and the preparations made by the Boers to maintain their threatened independence would not have been made. Injustice produced suspicion. Suspicion produced war. A handful of farmers did not challenge the might of the British Empire without ample grounds for so doing. Their independence was threatened. They had no confidence in any party in England strong enough to compel respect for it. They had bought it with blood and tears, and they did not intend to lose it without a struggle, let the odds against them be great or small. They have shown themselves men, and all the glory of the British Empire pales beside their heroism.

They found themselves face to face with a revival of the Beaconsfield Imperialism which confronted them in 1877. What this Imperialism is, what it means to free and independent foreigners, is exposed and denounced in an eloquent passage of the third speech of the Midlothian campaign. This passage contains, perhaps, the strongest and most unanswerable argument against Jingo Imperialism that has ever been put in type. It must be given in full:

"But, gentlemen, on that day the Prime Minister [Lord Beaconsfield at the Guildhall] speaking out—I do not question for a moment his own

sincere opinion—made what I think one of the most unhappy and ominous allusions ever made by a Minister of this country. He quoted certain words easily rendered as ‘Empire and Liberty’—words, he said, of a Roman statesman, words descriptive of the state of Rome—and he quoted them as words which were capable of legitimate application to the position and circumstances of England. I join issue with the Prime Minister upon that subject, and I affirm that nothing can be more fundamentally unsound, more practically ruinous, than the establishment of Roman analogies for the guidance of British policy. What, gentlemen, was Rome? Rome was, indeed, an Imperial State, you may tell me—I know not, I cannot read the counsels of Providence—a State having a mission to subdue the world; but a State whose very basis it was to deny the equal rights, to proscribe the independent existence of other nations. That, gentlemen, was the Roman idea. It has been partially and not ill described in three lines of a translation from Virgil by our great poet Dryden, which run as follows:

‘O Rome! ’tis thine alone with awful sway
To rule mankind, and make the world obey,
Disposing peace and war thine own majestic way.’

We are told to fall back upon this example. No doubt the word ‘Empire’ was qualified by the word ‘Liberty.’ But what did the two words, ‘Liberty’ and ‘Empire,’ mean in a Roman mouth? They meant simply this: ‘Liberty for yourselves, empire over the rest of mankind.’

“I do not think, gentlemen, that this Ministry, or any other Ministry, is going to place us in the position of Rome. What I object to is the revival of the idea—I care not how feebly, I care not even, from a philosophic or historic point of view, how ridiculous the attempt at this revival may be. I say it indicates an intention—I say it indicates a frame of mind, and that frame of mind, unfortunately, I find, has been consistent with the policy of which I have given you some illustrations—the policy of denying to others the rights that we claim for ourselves. No doubt, gentlemen, Rome may have had its work to do, and Rome did its work. But modern times have brought a different state of things. Modern times have established a sisterhood of nations, equal, independent; each of them built up under that legitimate defence which public law affords to every nation living within its own borders, and seeking to perform its own affairs; but if one thing more than another has been detestable to Europe, it has been the appearance upon the stage from time to time of men who, even in the times of the Christian civilisation, have been thought to aim at universal dominion. It was this aggressive disposition on the part of Louis XIV., King of France, that led your forefathers, gentlemen, freely to spend their blood and treasure in a cause not immediately their own, and to struggle against the method of policy which, having Paris for its centre, seemed to aim at a universal monarchy. It was the very same thing, a century and a half later, which was the charge launched, and justly launched, against Napoleon, that under his dominion France was not content even with her extended limits, but Germany, and Italy, and Spain, apparently without any limit to this pestilent and pernicious process, were to be brought under the dominion or influence of France, and national equality was to be trampled under foot and national rights denied. For that reason, England in the struggle almost exhausted herself, greatly impoverished her people, brought upon herself, and Scotland too, the consequences of a debt that nearly crushed her energies, and poured forth their best blood without limit, in order to resist and put down these intolerable pretensions. Gentlemen, it is but in a pale and weak and almost despicable miniature that such ideas are now set up, but

you will observe that the poison lies—that the poison and the mischief lie in the principle and not the scale. It is the opposite principle, which, I say, has been compromised by the action of the Ministry, and which I call upon you, and upon any who choose to hear my views, to vindicate when the day of election comes; I mean the sound and sacred principle that Christendom is formed of a band of nations who are united to one another in bonds of right; that they are without distinction of great and small: there is an absolute equality between them; the same sacredness defends the narrow limits of Belgium as attaches to the extended frontiers of Russia, or Germany, or France. I hold that he who, by act or word, brings that principle into peril or disparagement, however honest his intentions may be, places himself in the position of one inflicting—I will not say intending to inflict, I ascribe nothing of the sort—but inflicting injury upon his own country, and endangering the peace and all the most fundamental interests of Christian society.”

From his constant reference in this connection to Christian society it might be thought that Gladstone applied a different rule to non-Christian peoples. This, however, is not the case:

“Remember the rights of the savage, as we call him. Remember that the happiness of his humble home, remember that the sanctity of life in the hill villages of Afghanistan, among the winter snows, is as inviolable in the eyes of Almighty God as can be your own. Remember that He who has united you together in the same flesh and blood has bound you by the law of mutual love; that that mutual love is not limited by the shores of this island, is not limited by the boundaries of Christian civilisation, that it passes over the whole surface of the earth, and embraces the meanest along with the greatest in its unmeasured scope.”

This is from the second Midlothian speech. In this speech he denounces the burning of Afghan villages, and the driving forth of the women and children to perish in the snows of winter, and all “for a war as frivolous as ever was waged in the history of man.” He speaks also of the Zulus “mowed down by hundreds and by thousands, having committed no offence, but having, with rude and ignorant courage, done what were for them, and done faithfully and bravely what were for them, the duties of patriotism.”

He does not, however, “profess to believe that the state which society has reached permits us to make a vow of universal peace, and of renouncing, in all cases, the alternative of war.” But he does say that a long experience of life leads him, “not towards any abstract doctrine on the subject, but to a deeper and deeper conviction of the enormous mischiefs of war even under the best and most favourable circumstances, and of the mischiefs indescribable and the guilt unredeemed of causeless and unnecessary wars.”

His enemies—perhaps, I should say, his political opponents—accused him then, and they have accused him since, of being, in regard to war, a disciple of what has been called the Manchester school, or peace-at-any-price party. In point of fact, however, he was nothing of the kind. He respected that school even in what he conceived to be its “great and serious error,” but he makes the fact

very clear that from its doctrine concerning war he felt himself absolutely compelled to dissent. The fourth Midlothian speech contains many passages which leave no doubt whatever concerning this point :

"No Government of this country," says Gladstone in the speech just mentioned, "no Government of this country could ever accede to the management and control of affairs without finding that that dream of a Paradise upon earth was rudely dispelled by the shock of experience. However we may detest war— and you cannot detest it too much—there is no war—except a war for liberty—that does not contain in it elements of corruption, as well as of misery, that are deplorable to recollect and to consider ; but however deplorable they may be, they are among the necessities of our condition ; and there are times when justice, when faith, when the welfare of mankind require a man not to shrink from the responsibility of undertaking them."

As an example of one of those occasions when war is justifiable he gives the scheme for the destruction of the freedom, independence, and integrity of Belgium by the joint action of France and Prussia ; a scheme which was brought to light by Prince Bismark at the moment when these two Powers came into conflict in 1870 :

"Could there be," asks Gladstone, "a graver danger to Europe than that ? Here was a State, not like Turkey --the scandal of the world and the danger of the world from misgovernment, and from the horrible degradation it inflicted upon its subject races— but a country which was a model to all Europe for the peaceful exercise of the rights of freedom and for progress in all the arts and all the pursuits that tend to make mankind good and happy. And this country, having nothing but its weakness that could be urged against it, with its four or five millions of people, was deliberately pointed out by somebody [Was he that unscrupulous Imperialist, Louis Napoleon ?] and indicated to be destroyed, to be offered up as a sacrifice to territorial lust by one or other of those Ministers of a Power with whom we were living in close friendship and affection. We [the Liberals were then in power] felt called upon to enlist ourselves on the part of the British nation as advocates and as champions of the integrity and independence of Belgium. And if we had gone to war we should have gone to war for freedom— we should have gone to war for public right, we should have gone to war to save human happiness from being invaded by tyrannous and lawless power. That is what I call a good cause, gentlemen, and though I detest war, and there are no epithets too strong, if you could supply me with them, that I will not endeavour to heap upon its head, in such a war as that, while the breath in my body is continued to me I am ready to engage—I am ready to support it, I am ready to give all the help and aid I can to those who carry this country into it."

His strong support of the European Concert, not for council only, but for action when needed, was one of the means by which he sought to preserve the peace of Europe and of the world. That Concert, it must be confessed, was a miserable failure so far as the Armenian question was concerned ; but the idea which it embodies is undoubtedly the right direction in which to move for the establishment of lasting and universal peace. Even as peace within a state is

maintained by using the organised forces of that state to restrain those who attempt to break it, so the peace of the world might be maintained by means of an organised international force composed of the armies and navies of the various federated states, and placed under the control of an international parliament and executive, formed on purely democratic lines, and consisting of representatives freely elected by the federated peoples of the world. This at present looks utopian enough, but it is only the logical development of the idea embodied in Gladstone's conception of the European Concert. The objection that it is utopian applies equally to the idea of one particular nation exercising Imperial sway over all the other nations of the world, an idea which constitutes the very essence of British Jingoism. The question is, which is the loftier idea, which is the idea most consonant with justice, with the moral law, with the obligation we are under before God to do unto other nations as we would have other nations do unto us? Putting aside all personal interests, all personal ambitions, all personal sympathies for this people or for that people, and looking solely at the question from the point of view of the equal good and the equal rights of all the peoples of the earth, what reply does the reason within us make to this question? For this voice is God Himself speaking. In point of practicability there is more to be said for Gladstone's idea than for that of the Jingo Imperialist. It would be much more difficult for England to bring all other nations under her Imperial sway, than for her to persuade all other nations to form with her a voluntary federation for the preservation of the world's peace, while maintaining, in the meantime, by force if necessary, her own undoubted rights. I take it that this last is the Liberal position. It is a position in harmony with Liberal principles. It is a position which reason dictates and conscience approves. It demands the shirking of no patriotic duty. It involves the infliction of no wrong upon other nations. It permits other nations to inflict no wrong upon yourselves. It is a position which no man need be ashamed to maintain before God and in the face of mankind. The federation of the nations for the preservation of peace—in this lies the reconciliation of national independence with the requirements of international justice. The object is clear and specific. It involves no interference with the just internal government of any country. It merely means the collective provision of an international force adequate to prevent one nation from aggressing upon another, and to compel quarrelling nations to submit their disputes for final settlement to the decision of an international tribunal in which they would enjoy the same representation as others. Under this arrangement the world would form one empire, but it would be of a character totally different from that which the Jingo has in contemplation. Instead of being based upon the violation of national rights, it would

be based upon respect for them, and its only object would be to maintain them. Instead of being got by wading through seas of blood, and filling the world with widows and orphans, it would be a conquest of reason, and when established it would be as near an approach to an empire of reason as the imperfections of human nature will permit.

All the advantages of the general peace secured by Rome to those nations which she brought by force beneath her rule, would be equally secure under this empire; but they would be secured without the sacrifice of that national independence which it was the shame of Rome to trample in the dust. I admit that there is an advantage in extended empire. It tends to keep at peace those nations over which it extends. It did so in the case of Rome. But are there no advantages in freedom? Are there no advantages in national independence? Without the life infused into them by these priceless blessings, do not nations stagnate and rot, however prosperous outwardly they may be, in their enforced subjection to a superior race of people? For nations, like individuals, do not and cannot live by bread alone. They require the risks and the responsibilities, the dangers and the duties, which freedom and independence alone can give. These are the requisites of national manhood, and no nation can reach the full stature of its life without them. Did not the subject nations under Rome, deprived of the risks and responsibilities, the dangers and duties, of freedom and independence, stagnate and rot in their too dearly-bought security, until the empire which they constituted fell before the forces generated by the freedom and independence of barbarism? That species of Imperialism which means the rule of one nation or one race over other nations and races, has been tried by Rome for centuries on a large scale, and it has been found wanting. The good which it secured was more than counterbalanced by the evils which it involved and the disaster to which it led. We must profit by this lesson. We must call it to mind whenever we are tempted to sacrifice national freedom and national independence for the sake of international peace. The truth is that there must be no sacrifice of one good to another good. Peace is good, but we must not purchase it with our birthright, freedom. Unity is good, but independence is far too heavy a price to pay for it. Whatever our future international organisation may be, whatever may be the constitution of our coming international empire, it must be based upon a frank and full respect for these great national essentials. In the unity of the world's federation there must be the trinity of peace, freedom, independence.

I might pursue this subject further, but it would carry me too far away from the main object with which I set out. That object was to show that in the principles of Gladstone's foreign policy we

possess a clear alternative to Jingo Imperialism, which means : Keep what you have got and grab all you can get that belongs to others. The principles of Liberalism, so far as Gladstone understood them in their bearing on foreign policy, may be shortly expressed in the command to respect the rights of other nations and maintain your own. To be strictly correct I ought to add a still further command, and it is this : Do what you can to help other nations to maintain their rights. For, after all, as James Russell Lowell asks :

“ Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And, with leathern hearts forget
That we owe mankind a debt ?

“ No ! True freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And with heart and hand to be
Earnest to make others free.”

This is the creed of Liberalism as Gladstone understood it, and as it is in itself independently of Gladstone or of any other person. For principles are above persons, and persons are themselves only of value in the world so far as they are animated by a disinterested love for principles, expressing itself in a fixed endeavour to realise them in conduct. It was this that made the moral greatness of Gladstone. He rose above the narrow, the personal, the national, into that realm where Reason lays down its laws for all mankind. He thought more of the rights of others than of sordid gain for himself, for his party, or even for his country. Only so far as those who are at the head of affairs in all countries rise to a similar height, and are animated by a similar spirit, will the rights of nations and the peace of the world be secured.

M. D. O'BRIEN.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE PRESENT WAR; AND HOW WE ARE TO PREVENT ANY MORE SUCH WARS.

I. CONSEQUENCES OF THE WAR.

THE war has already lasted twenty months, is costing us £2,500,000 a week, and will, before it is over, have cost us at least £200,000,000, and added £15,000,000 to our national expenditure, viz., £5,000,000 additional war expenditure, and £10,000,000 additional interest on the National Debt, and will consequently have at once utterly impoverished us and used up all our resources, and, at the same time, plunged us head over ears into a fearfully augmented national debt, to be met by a no less fearfully diminished national income.

Hence our poor are poorer than ever, whilst the well-to-do have nothing to spare for them. The sexagenarian has lost the very faintest hope of an old-age pension, the national school-child of a free and gratis breakfast, the poor of decent housing, and all of any good whatever. Free trade is in serious danger, and conscription is knocking at the door. Our imports are increasing, our exports are decreasing, and the population of Ireland is daily getting less and less in an ever-augmenting ratio. And, worst of all, we are obviously deteriorating; if, indeed, there be any truth in the teaching of all history, from the Trojan war until now, we must be.

That war is the most depraving of all things all history proves, even if it were not quite self-evident, stirring up as it does all the vilest and most execrable passions of human nature and making man little better than an incarnate fiend.

How far we have deteriorated appears from our doings, at once eastward in China and southward in Africa. No pillage was ever more complete than that wrought by the Allies in China; and the consequent famine was terrible. And after we have thus avenged ten thousand times over the trumpery "persecution" of our missionaries and the quite futile siege of the legations, China has still to pay a compensation of nearly half an American billion dollars. And for what? For not being able for the moment wholly to prevent a petty broker's percentage of the mischief the Boxer

rebellion was doing her from touching the hem of our garments. And all this clearly proves that in demoralising ourselves we have demoralised Europe also by our atrocious example. Above all, we have demoralised America, and McKinley threatens to better in the Philippines Kitchener's example in the Transvaal.

And our Tommy Atkinses are the most demoralised of all, and so may prove as infectious a curse to us as the last of the heroes proved to Greece on their return from Troy. Blood, and such blood, and shed so worse than uselessly, is a moral poison, which one must either void by Thyestian vomiting or die of. The groans of the wounded, the glazing eyes of the dying, the pool of blood in which the dead lie, and their subsequent stench, must petrify every heart that they do not melt.

Such are the present immediate consequences of the war, obvious to the meanest capacity: South Africa utterly ruined and more implacably hostile, and with better reason, than Ireland ever was; ourselves miserably impoverished, and yet more horribly deteriorated, and our army necessarily far the most so, and consequently, when it comes back, infecting the rest of the population, and aiding and abetting a Jingo Government in its most sinister attempts upon our liberties; and Europe (1) horror-struck at our Cain-like murder of the two African Republics; (2) astonished at our incapacity, in that with a quarter of a million men and the entire wealth of the Empire we cannot overcome the resistance of a few thousand Boers, but are reduced (oh, ignominy far worse than Majuba!) to summon the natives to our aid; (3) alarmed and incensed at our abnormal growth from under 6,000,000 square miles in 1848 to 9,000,000 in 1886, 12,000,000 now, and probably 15,000,000 or 16,000,000 a few years hence; and (4) demoralised by our example, and for all these reasons ready at the first convenient opportunity to fall on and Polandise us, whilst the Yankees, actuated by the self-same motives, may perchance annex part of, if not all, Canada and Jamaica, by no means unwilling to be so annexed. Even already Russia has annexed Manchuria, and France is projecting a Moroccan protectorate.

And now comes the bill to pay. The worst possible Government introduces the worst possible Budget. The sugar duty and the loan are as bad as bad can be, but something perhaps may be said in favour of, as well as against, the coal duty. The less competition there is for an article abroad, the more the price should go down at home. And with coal so scandalously dear as it has been that is surely a good thing. Also, as the coal owner has gained so largely by the war, it is only fair that he should contribute largely. Also the more unnecessary and, except when used very moderately, the more positively deleterious an article is the higher the import duty should be; and, on the contrary, the more necessary an article is the more objectionable is any import duty whatever on it, but the

less objectionable is an *export* duty, unless we have such a superfluity of it as, judging 'as I say from its price of late, does not appear to be at all the case with coal, but the very contrary. Yet this item of the Budget has been most opposed. And why? In the interest of the poor coal serf, or on pure abstract free-trade principles? Oh, dear me, no; but in the interest of that cruellest and greediest of all capitalists—the mine owner. Such are the great radical principles of export and import duties. And the great principle of taxation for as questionable a war as this is that it should be mainly defrayed by those that have forced it on. But the bill for this war is to fall, bar the 2d. income-tax, on those that have least of all forced it on: (1) The innocent child mulcted of his principal sensual gratification; (2) our posterity yet unborn; (3) the poor underground toiling colliers; (4) the foreigner, that, as every one must admit, has utterly abhorred the war from the very first. But those that have done all in their power to force on the war and gained enormously by it—the Jingo press, the army contractors, &c.—will pay the merest fraction out of their unrighteous gains.

But the Budget is not all, far from it. What is an additional 2d. on the income-tax compared with the miserable diminution of income sustained by our non-Jingo literature, our charities, and all but the barest and most beggarly elements of education? For all these expenses, only too easy to dispense with as they seem, are of course the first to feel the pinch of the grim economy necessitated by the terrible shrinkage of the national purse.

Such are the consequences of the war in Europe, *white* South Africa and America. Last of all for the consequences in Asia and *black* South Africa.

The rank injustice and utterly heathenish want of human sympathy with the Boers has its exact counterpart, only on a larger scale, in the case of China.

"The rank injustice" the indignant reader of this essay has seen already. "The utterly heathenish want of human sympathy" it now only remains to show.

They have a labour problem just now in Rhodesia, and some are for importing additional labour from China, and others are for importing it from Australia only, if any really needs importing. Major Maurice Meany, advocating the importation of Chinese labour, speaks as follows: "I do not say it must be Chinamen, but I do say that extraneous labour must be introduced from somewhere. If it is not the Chinaman it is likely to be the East Indian. But he is a British subject, and therefore you cannot control him at your pleasure as you can the Kaffir or the Chinaman. Besides, he is physically unsuited to heavy mining work, and too easily succumbs to fever. So it will have to be the Mongolian—either that or disaster. Rhodesia is almost entirely dependent upon the mining

companies. Fully 90 per cent. of the money spent in it issues from their cheque books. That being so, the chief interest of the country is the well-being of the mines, and the most crying need of the mines is a certain and abundant labour supply.

"If the Chinaman is admitted his stay will be temporary. He must go when the natives have learned to work. No mine-owner would dispense with *them* altogether; the cheapness of their labour will always prevent that. Meanwhile he must come as a hewer of wood and a drawer of water—is nearly a beast of burden as it is possible to make the human animal into. He may not become a miner, neither may he hold a prospector's licence, nor a licence to trade. No white man may enter into partnership with him for the performance of contracts, nor may he enter into contracts upon his own account. He may neither acquire nor rent any house, lands, claims, or premises. He will come simply as a miner, a field hand, or a domestic servant. He may not be a hauling engineer, a mine carpenter, a fitter, a smith, or a painter. He may not engage in any handicraft whatsoever, nor handle explosives or firearms.

"On these terms we propose to import Chinese labour, even as the Americans propose to import it into the Philippines, but temporarily only. When the native is able to take his place Chiny must go; and as his wants are many times greater than those of the native, and his wage will consequently be higher, he will go, driven out by no compulsion, but ousted in the natural course of things by cheaper labour."

To this the opponents of Chinese labour reply thus:

"But will the gentle Child of the Sun consent to walk in the roseate paths thus selected for him? And if not, what then? Are we strong enough to tackle 10,000 Chinamen? And if we were, could we make them work against their will? And if they would not work have we prison accommodation enough for them?

"If the position is fully explained to them beforehand, the Chinese will never leave the Sacred Land of the Sun for wages that we are already paying the negro, neither will they do negro's work. And if it is not, when they find it out for themselves there will be, as I have said, the devil to pay. And, even if it were not so, when he has his liberty and is satisfied with his position, the Chiny is individually a hardworking, quiet and trusty servant, and labourer; but even then he has proved a curse and a nuisance to every country into which he has been imported wholesale."

Is it possible to be more unchristianly, more inhumanly unsympathetic than the Meanyites? Yes, the anti-Meanyites are. Just as in the great American slave war the North actually loathed the blacks, so do the anti-Meanyites loathe the yellows; and just as the South regarded the one as a mere implement of cheap labour, so do the Meanyites regard the other. Obviously, if the Australians

would work cheap enough they would be fifty times better to import than the Chinkies. But they will not. So, either the latter must come to the rescue or the mines won't pay. The Meanyites therefore propose to cheat them into five years of downright slavery; and then, when they find that they have been infamously swindled, the provision of the anti-Meanyites will be doubtless realised. Accordingly, the great amalgamator, Rhodes, has another string to his bow—a combination of all the great mining firms of the Rand for the regulation and control of the native labour supply. And then the hapless children of Ham will soon find that they have but exchanged the whips of austere Bible-Christians for the scorpions of godless Mammonites. The gold and diamond owners could never get the Boers to administer with sufficient severity the Pass Law, which forbade the native to move about without the written permission of his master; or the Flogging Law, which provided for the flogging of all Kaffir miners who were lazy over their taskwork. The subjugation of the Boers will enable the mine-owners to enforce these laws with sevenfold stringency, and thereby compel the natives to work their hardest for them for next to nothing; practically to reduce them to utter serfdom by means of the Rhodes Trust. Kruger prevented the formation of this Trust: *hinc illa lachryma*; hence lie No. 1, "Codlin's the friend not Short," and lie No. 2, "Codlin only wanted his rights" (whereas he really wanted to sell the Republic into subjugation to a foreign yoke in the interest of his most filthy lucre); which twin lies forced on the most shamelessly fraudulent and treacherous war, bar one—the opium war with China—that perhaps ever disgraced humanity. The Trust, backed by Chamberlain, will collect and distribute labour at so much per head; will collect "concessions and privileges" from the native chiefs; that is, induce them to sell their miserable subjects into slavery for, say, a bottle of rum apiece; and lastly, take over "other businesses indirectly connected with native labour"; in other words, shut up all the male population of the Rand in pens, like so many cattle (as at Kimberley), and then cater for them on the "Tommy-rot" system.

Sixty millions have been sunk in the mines; and without sweating the blacks, and swindling the yellows, and enslaving both most atrociously, the investment may prove an unsatisfactory one. But after spending millions of money and thousands of lives in a war which, in their criminal "haste to be rich" they forced on, shall we permit the mammon-worshippers to convert South Africa into a great slave dependency, and ultimately destroy the native races, exactly as Spain in the fifteenth century destroyed them in Hispaniola and Cuba? And instead of Panbuddhistan occupying its heaven-appointed sphere—China, Japan, Burmah, Siam, Indo-China, and Malasia—shall the "meek children of righteous Abel" become

mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the blood-incarnadined children of Cain? I devoutly hope not. It is my firm, undoubting faith that our Colonies are our strength, and our conquests our weakness—the one our actual growth, the other our morbid tumours. The fact that our population has increased more from 1891 to 1901 than it did from 1881 to 1891 would seem to show that the tide *has* not even yet, in spite of our countless wars, or at least to the present war, *had* not begun to turn. But should our population ever cease to increase, while our Empire still keeps on increasing, till, by the annexation of Greenland, Arabia, Antarcadia, Thibet, Siam, Trans-Equatorial Africa, Polynesia, &c., it has grown to, say, 16,000,000 or 18,000,000, we shall inevitably decline and fall exactly as Rome did.

II. HOW TO PREVENT THE RECURRENCE OF SUCH WARS AS THIS.

Unless our territory or that of an ally is attacked or threatened by a formal declaration of war, or our ships are attacked or prevented by threats from pursuing their course, or barbarous races refuse us admission into their territory, or, when there, put us to death for no fault worthy thereof either by their law or ours, and refuse atonement therefor; except in these cases, *all war is wholesale murder*; and however justifiable the war may be in its inception, its continuation is no less wholesale murder when the enemy is driven out of our territory, and is willing to offer peace or to accept it when offered, the dispute that led to the invasion to be then taken up at the point where the negotiations between us were broken off, and finally settled either by mutual agreement or by the Amphictyonic Council of Europe to be hereafter constituted.

How, then, shall we prevent such wars for the time to come?

I. All the members of a Government that engages in such a war should be impeached when it is over.

II. All organs of the Press should be strictly forbidden (1) to discuss any controversy or negotiation pending between us and another Power, except to advocate reconciliation or arbitration; (2) when war is being actually waged to print one line tending to prevent peace from being made and negotiations resumed as soon as possible.

III. When an ambassador acts as Sir Stratford Canning did before the Crimean war, he should at once be disowned and recalled, and never again employed.

IV. The members of a Government that involves us in war without previous full discussion in both Houses should, by a new law of high treason, be made guilty thereof.

V. Any soldier that objects on conscientious grounds to serve in any future war should be allowed his discharge.

VI. The elements of English and universal history, and of moral and political philosophy, should be taught in all Board schools.

VII. Any Jingoism holding a pro-war, or interrupting an anti-war, meeting should be punished with the utmost possible severity.

VIII. No theatres should be permitted by the Lord Chamberlain in their plays, no music-halls should be permitted by the magistracy in their songs, to advocate Jingo-worship.

IX. We have offended the moral sense of Europe by this liberticidal war against our fellow Teutons and fellow Protestants. If, then, we would avert the looming war of all Europe against us we must restore to its lawful owner Malta, which we should not have retained when we first wrenched it out of the sceptred highwayman's grasp, still less when to retain it we violated the Peace of Amiens, and deluged Europe with blood for thirteen years thereby. And we must cease to claim the Mediterranean as a British lake; else may our wicked injustice towards the Maltese even yet prove the ultimate cause of our ruin.

X. The Church of England must be duly warned that if it stands by without protesting against wholesale murder, as it has, alas, always hitherto done, it will be deprived of the vast political power it has misused so perniciously; in other words, will be disestablished and disendowed, and its tithes go to prevent poor old England from becoming one vast grazing ground.

But all this is not enough, or nearly so. The question of war must cease altogether to be a political question between the Coodles and the Doodles, and be elevated to a moral one, on which no two opinions are permissible, in school, theatre, music-hall, lecture-room, newspaper, magazine, review, church, or chapel. No deacon, priest, or bishop should be ordained or consecrated without giving in his solemn adhesion to the principle contained in my first paragraph, and pledging himself to enforce it throughout his parish or diocese. And to our prayer-book should be added a prayer against, and a fortieth article upon the wholesale murder of all unnecessary wars.

XI. When the anti-war party returns to power it should institute a thorough inquiry into all the circumstances of the present war, from August 19, 1899, to its close, and publish the same with a sketch of the present Government's preliminary doings after the failure of the Jameson Raid.

XII. Since their colossal armaments are the main cause of the heavy duties of the Continent, we might offer our colonies, America, Russia, Scandinavia, Spain, and Italy (with none of whom any sane Government will ever hereafter go to war) *perfect* Free Trade and no duties on anything, whilst very heavily increasing the duties on the exports of all other Powers that persist in Protection.

F. A. WHITE.

POLITICAL SOCIETY AND UTILITARIANISM.

THE doctrine of evolution has very much altered the way in which the intellectual world looks at these subjects; but we are still dilatory and backward in policy and methods of government for giving effect to the reforms which science and common sense, and the higher moral feeling that comes of intellectual conviction, recognise as necessary to harmonise social relations with modern theories of development. This incompetence on the part of the machine of State is, doubtless, connected with the "party system"; but as "party" seems necessarily incidental to representative institutions, the failure of the system to meet the political requirements of modern times must be referred to the particular conditions under which it has been evolved and now operates.

In order that these may be properly understood, we must look back in history to the last centuries of the Roman Empire and the first of the Christian Church, when the aristocratic and sacerdotal orders became associated in authority with the Imperial power as temporal and spiritual barriers against popular aggression on its autocratic rule; and were then, or subsequently, made independent of the general community by territorial or other endowment. Although these two constituents of political society have undergone many changes in the long interval since elapsed, they still remain essentially the same, and the old traditions of privileged authority still form the basis and standpoint of their policy. And so persistent is the influence that these traditions exercise over individual minds through hereditary family associations, that we see statesmen and politicians, whose personal qualities would lead to an expectation of candid sympathy with the advanced political and social tendencies of the age, taking every opportunity to maintain and even improve the status of these privileged orders. It is, therefore, obvious that the "party system," as now dominated by traditional policy, can never operate steadily and impartially for the general good as the true idea of "government" implies and requires.

Tracing the course of European civilisation from the institution of the privileged orders, we find that their power and influence, and the intellectual and economic condition of society are inversely

related, so that as one is greater, the other is less. The most complete and convincing proof of this is found in the intellectual darkness and lethargy that overwhelmed society in the "middle ages" under the sway of Papal Rome; and, conversely, in the new life and vigour that resulted from the intellectual, humanistic movement which closed that period and led in time to the Protestant Reformation, and through that to an increase of political and civil freedom. From such facts as these it becomes apparent that there is a natural antagonism between social development and arbitrary authority; and this is confirmed and explained by science as the result of the different modes of thought that belong to one and the other. The scientific conception of society is that of an organic entity which develops automatically in proportion as its individual members engage in industrial pursuits that improve the intellect and the economic conditions of life, and react so as to produce a general amelioration of manners and customs tending more and more to civilisation. On the other hand, the mode of thought which centres in the individual "self," its ideal emotions and abstractions, has enabled men of stronger character and a disposition to mental abstraction and speculation to acquire pre-eminence and authority over their fellows, and has resulted in military autocracy and privileged authority on the one hand, and on the other, in the metaphysical philosophies and theologies, and generally in the exaggerated influence which the individualistic principle has exercised on society.

Philosophy and theology are grouped together as above because they proceed from the same system of thought that has overawed mankind; but as theology, when it takes the form of a defined religion, founds its particular tenets on tradition and the dogma of divine revelation, it is necessary, in order to obtain a proper estimate of its pretensions to the discovery and possession of supernatural truth, to carry its connection with philosophy still further. It is therefore desirable to point out that theology has always been indebted to philosophy for supplying it with artificial reasons in support of its leading assumptions concerning the supernatural, and more particularly that, in the case of the Orthodox Church, the cardinal dogma of the Trinity is derived from the Neo-Platonic doctrine of the "logos" (the "word" and "reason" of the Greeks), imaged as a real substantive entity, which in the form of the "Triune Godhead" became incorporated with Christianity through a Theosophic sect of Neo-Platonists in the first centuries of our era. Thus, the origin of this cardinal doctrine is traceable to philosophic speculation, and has only the value which that can bestow; and it is made evident that the Church is not justified in its claim to universal and absolute authority in religion and morals; and the injustice and detriment to society are aggravated by the compact

between it and the State, by which it has obtained political status as a privileged order, and helped to maintain every kind of arbitrary authority and social monopoly by the special dogmas of "divine right" and "providential order"—whether just or unjust, moral or immoral—and also by the general character of its teaching, which tends to stimulate to an excessive degree the individual egotistic emotions. For these reasons the Church and its political and social influences are regarded as the most important factors in the character and operation of the "party system" as now in force. The other factors are the "Lords," their parliamentary prerogative and territorial influence. These are so well known, and so frequently denounced as relics of the feudal system and out of harmony with the times, that little need be said concerning them. It may, however, be noticed that they are the centre round which all other "vested interests" gather for support in resisting popular reforms that tend to abridge their privileges; and as these are constantly growing with great rapidity, the obstruction to fair and equitable government, which the "party system" creates, becomes daily greater. Such pressing reforms as a liberal and scientific system of public education, the amendment of the land-laws—to alter the devolution of real estate so as to prevent its accumulation in the hands of monopolists, and to make it more easily available for public purposes—the better housing of the working and poorer classes, and an alleviation of the hardships of the aged poor, also an abatement of the evils of the liquor traffic and the licensing system, are cases in point, and demand from the general public an intelligent appreciation of the causes that make the "party system" inoperative for the general good; and this is more necessary, as these causes are gaining strength from an increase in the spirit of militarism and Imperialism among a large and influential portion of society, and from a tendency in a section of the Church towards sacerdotal absolutism, whose final goal might be Romanism and even the restoration of Papal supremacy.

Having shown that the coercive authority of militarism and sacerdotalism can never reconcile the general good of society with individual assertiveness and egotism, we must turn again to science and the doctrine of evolution for the solution of the problem. Reference has previously been made to the scientific conception of society as an organism whose development depends upon the principles of intellectualism and industrialism. It follows from this that the good of society requires that care should be taken to train each individual member so that he may become adapted in mind and character to discharge, with the greatest advantage to society and himself, the duties which may fall to his lot in life to perform. Justice to the individual requires this, as it is society that makes the demand and imposes obligations that result in his happiness, or the

contrary, according to his ability to fulfil them. Thus the happiness of the individual is identified with his fitness to conform to the rules of conduct which custom has established as the standard of social morals; and as this is the essence of the doctrine that "utility" is the only equitable and efficient basis on which morality rests, it results that the object of education should be to guide and develop the tendencies of the individual from his earliest years, when the formation of habit begins, so that on entering life as an independent, responsible agent his mental and moral nature may incline to pursuits and conduct beneficial to society and himself. Intellectual and moral characters tend to become automatic and instinctive, and through the law of heredity, and the cumulative improvement in each generation effected by education, this tendency becomes diffused throughout society, so as ultimately to form a bond of sympathy uniting the various parts and members of the social organism and reconciling their several interests.

In order that these intellectual and moral formative principles may obtain their proper value in social evolution, it is essential that "government" should be placed in the hands of those whose intellect and character have been formed under their influence, and that parliamentary method should be purified and emancipated from the elements which now make it so largely merely a means of maintaining the prejudices and interests of "class," and a corresponding cause of obstruction to measures designed for the public good.

Those who have served society in the past in the cause of liberty and reform, whether civil or religious, have been of the type above referred to; and, doubtless, the same character of men now exist in even greater number, from the stimulus to the intellect and motives in that direction imparted by modern science in all departments of knowledge; but the way is barred to their engaging in politics with any effect by the forces of obstruction that now prevail in parliamentary procedure. It is, however, to such men only that the country can look for the fundamental changes required to render Government and Parliament competent to discharge the trust confided to them by the nation, and to give us the reality in place of the mere semblance of free institutions, and also the social reforms that will remove the blots that now stain our civilisation. The preliminary, indispensable changes necessary to these ends are the disestablishment of the Church and the "ending" of the "Lords"—accompanied, probably, in the case of the latter, by the construction of a "Second Chamber" on a new basis, and under due limitations as regards its control of legislation.

These questions of "Church" and "Lords" have somewhat fallen into the background of current politics, and it seems to be more than time that they were brought to the forefront again as matters to be fought for in earnest and settled once for all. If an agitation

was revived by an influential section of the electorate, it would probably soon gather a strength that would make it irresistible and ultimately lead to victory. It is, therefore, suggested that the trades-unions, through their councils and general parliamentary committee, should take up these questions and give them prominence in their political programme, so as to keep them well before the country as reforms having their unanimous support, and to which their nominees to parliamentary vacancies would be required to pledge themselves and to forward by every possible means, both in and out of Parliament.

The special reforms previously noticed as delayed by the present operation of the "party system" are, it is true, matters more directly concerning the working-classes; but they are also of vital consequence to the nation; for, after all, the "workers," their numerical increase, qualifications and general welfare are the foundation on which our national prosperity rests, and on which the stability and permanence of our empire and civilisation depend.

JOSEPH M. A. BROWN

THE PSYCHIC ACTION OF GENIUS.

MEN of genius are the symbols and the finger-posts which nature unfolds here and there as indications of the mathematical and psychic progression in the visible and the invisible world in which we live. The human brain is the most powerful embodiment of electro-magnetic energy of which we have any knowledge. This is why thinkers often receive simultaneous impressions regarding things of universal importance. The brain of one thinker acts as an invisible conductor to another; the interchange of psychic force is produced without conscious effort. Nature has placed her psychic batteries all over the world in the exact positions required; the invisible conductors are at work everywhere; the magnetic currents meet and mingle, or cross and re-cross, according to affinity or repulsion. When the brain of genius becomes highly charged with electric energy consciousness becomes illuminated; in such moments it arrives at the truth as by a flash, and we call it intuition, but illumination is the proper word.

Consciousness is lit much as darkness is lit by a flash of lightning. At such times the intellect becomes clairvoyant. In science it discovers, in poetry it announces a rhythmic truth, in worldly affairs it attains the prophetic. Considered in its relation to material things it is mechanical; the brain acts with the precision of a well-regulated instrument; and the difference between the brain of talent and the brain of genius is the difference between an ordinary watch and a chronometer.

But the personal quality of genius is anything but mechanical. Genius, therefore, has a dual quality; in the world of invisible forces it is mechanical, in the social world it has a personality distinct and apart from all others. But the mechanical action of one harmonious brain in communication with another must not be confounded with the abnormal and eccentric manifestations of hypnotic subjects. In the illuminating process of the brain, in its highest development, there is no guessing or groping after truth. Genius is a mathematical and psychic progression. The most harmonious minds have well-rounded heads, and the more irregular the head the more erratic the mind. It is not possible to think of Shakespeare or Darwin

with a head displaying angular bumps, with suspicious and envious eyes. An intelligent student of human nature can form an adequate notion of a man's head and face from the style and thought of his work—in all of which we see a well-defined law, a clearly defined force manifesting in the world of thought and matter.

Nature builds by degrees; the intellect is developed in exact harmony with the physical law, and the one cannot exist without the other. The reason why there is so much blundering in diplomacy and statecraft is that the poorly developed brains are oftener than not placed in control of matters which only genius could hope to elucidate. But the greatest thinkers never concern themselves with local conditions and interests. There is a sort of unconscious freemasonry among the most gifted minds, but the fraternal spirit is not confined to any school or nation; it is universal, for genius and provincialism are inimical. In time, the provincial spirit is pushed aside by the inexorable forces of world-development. In the highest regions of science, as in the highest regions of literature, no thought is given to what the world thinks or does. Newton and Darwin were not concerned about local prejudices when they were discovering some of the long-hidden secrets of nature. In all manifestations of genius, whether taken singly or in groups, there is something apart from the crowd and the public. A king is not constrained to keep within the limits of a titled circle in his intercourse with society, for he may have commoners as intimate friends; but men of genius are constrained by a rigid law of nature to have as friends only those who possess an intellectual affinity for the work of genius. Frederick the Great, who had the wit and imagination of a thinker, took delight in the society of Voltaire, who possessed more wit than the king.

In the laws which govern this intellectual force there is something magical. In the electric currents that flow from one brain to another there is a force that sets at naught all other forces, overruling and dominating the seeming puissance of the physical. Invisible force is infinitely more potent than anything apparent and tangible. Perhaps, if the secret forces of nature could be divined, they would appal some minds who think that all unpleasant truth can be buried out of sight by cleverly planned codes and subtle devices. For the mystery is this: signposts which mark the latest development of the human intelligence are invisible to the world at large, just as the farthest stars are invisible to people without telescopes. A Kepler is *en rapport* with his subject. He deals with the science of astronomy in a way the tyro cannot understand; his calculations are accurate and his reasoning just. When he announces a new discovery, competent astronomers know the meaning of his symbols, and his figures. His discovery stands for a fixed fact, but it remains a mystery to other minds who

are incapable of any deep, discriminating effort of reason and imagination.

What occurs in the astronomical world occurs in the world of philosophy and literature. But the brains endowed with psychic energy and imagination are attracted and held by unwritten laws far more binding than those recorded in any book. Nature rises above systems and written codes; but the law of intellect now is what it was for Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. This law is acting in London and Paris as it acted in Athens and Rome. One hour's conversation with Socrates did as much for Athenian superstition as Samson's fox did for the cornfields of the Philistines. But whereas Samson's fox passed through the land like a fiery, flying serpent, and was a visible phenomenon, the influence of Socrates was a manifestation of hidden, intangible force, unconquerable and indestructible. No one could solve the Socratic mystery. We cannot explain the force of an electric battery by handling it; neither could the rulers of Athens nullify the influence of Socrates by suppressing the man. When Walter Savage Landor said: "Give me ten competent minds as readers," he knew that the dynamic forces of his intellect would harmonise with the latent or active forces of ten competent minds unknown to him, and so act and react on others. He knew that the psychic waves evolved in his brain would flow on through others, fulfilling the intended mission of inexorable and immutable law. A man whose brain is a storehouse of electric force may sit quietly in an obscure corner of the world and launch his psycho-electric currents of thought in a thousand directions by what De Quincey terms a drop of ink on the point of a pen. He needs no wires, no intricate machinery, no light or dark room for the taking and developing of his mental pictures. The machinery is invisible, intangible. It was set up and regulated at the beginning of things, and the mystery of its creation has remained an unscrutable secret. We may reason away everything else in the world; we may explain and analyse all other phenomena by study, research, and worldly knowledge; the mystery of spiritual force is one with the eternal mystery of the unknowable. This force never conforms to inferior conditions. It moves and acts in its own sphere. And the minds which desire any knowledge of it must be willing to mount towards it. To obtain any benefit from an electric battery one must come in contact with the two poles of the battery. And it is only a wise use of such an instrument which gives us any benefit. The moment we begin to tinker with it the electric current ceases, and we defeat our purpose.

A new cycle begins with every new genius. Plato followed Socrates, and Aristotle followed Plato. Of these three cycles the last assumed a scientific form. Nature never moves by fits and starts. Aristotle was not possible before Plato, nor Plato before Socrates. Out of the intuitive and the speculative, scientific know-

ledge is evolved and made known—for thought must precede action. Ideas rule the world, says Plato; but an idea without action is a barren thing. And so nature has ordained that ideas engender action. Out of the psychic world of Socrates and Plato issued Aristotle; out of the pen of Voltaire came the sword of Bonaparte. Perhaps of all the puerile efforts made by impotent man, the effort of criticising and explaining away the doings of this or that man of genius is the most foolish. The moment we begin to look into history, and put one name against another, that moment our efforts at moralising and sermonising appear vain and altogether void of reason. We may discover where a cycle began and where it ended, but that is all. We see Voltaire, Rousseau and Bonaparte; we see the local revolution of 1789, and then the universal upheaval of Napoleon. We recognise ideas first, then words, then deeds. But when we begin to criticise Bonaparte we become mere children, unless we consider the forces that produced Bonaparte. We are compelled to go back and face Voltaire and all the encyclopedists who worked to bring about the revolution. When we have done this we realise the futility of explaining away the deeds of Napoleon. If we have any conception of mathematical unity, of the cyclic action of human thought, we give up the game of psychological guess-work, and accept the inexorable decrees of the hidden and unwritten laws of psycho-cyclic development. To explain away genius is to explain the unknowable. In other words, to do so implies the getting rid of scientific law and putting in its place sentiment, theory, and guess-work. And since every man has his own opinion one would be just as proper as another.

In every country the action of genius is visible in cyclic waves. In Germany we see Kant, Goethe, Schopenhauer, Wagner and Nietzsche. There is here no sign of chance-work. The cyclic development is as marked as that of the Socratic cycle in Greece, or that of the Voltarian cycle in France; for there can be no psychical action without ideas. This is why nature, for example, did not constitute Macaulay a psychic centre. When, half a century ago, Macaulay said that there was not a writer living who would be read in fifty years, he spoke as a blind man in a blind world. His brain was not of the generative order; he possessed material power without the psychic energy.

Nature often ordains her cycles by threes. Socrates, Plato and Aristotle in philosophy; Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides in the drama; Mozart, Beethoven and Wagner in music. But it is impossible to fix a limit to the duration of the cyclic action, since it is impossible to tell where or how the first manifestation occurred. Such reasoning would not only take us to the dawn of history, but far into the eons of geological formations, through the fauna and fossils of mammal and mollusk to the first visible sign of corporeal

life in the Olenellus zone, and out of that into the jelly masses without motion, into the æriform bodies, until we face, once more, the starry heavens of astronomical science and the inexorability of the psychic principle manifest in cyclic and mathematical evolution. Kant was filled with awe when he looked at the stars and thought of the moral law. But the moral law is the psychical principle in cyclic progression. The ideas which impress us most at this epoch are very different from those which animated our ancestors. There is but one force and one meaning; but force is of untold variability. The things we see through the telescope harmonise in motion with the things that are visible on our own planet. All the worlds differ in character, but they are governed by the law which governs all things here. Astronomy is the science of psycho-physical motion. The fixed stars, planets, comets, and nebulous formations have their counterparts in our little world. For human beings differ as the heavenly bodies differ, and, like the suns and planets, human beings may be divided into two classes: the luminous and the non-luminous. Groups of men are attracted and held by central minds; they revolve with mathematical precision, as the moon round the earth, and both round the sun. For the notion that we are free agents cannot be considered as scientifically demonstrable. The illusions of sight and sense cause us to think ourselves free; for without these illusions conscious existence would become unbearable. Without the light and heat of the sun there would be no life on our planet; without the illuminating minds of genius there would be no light in the world of the intellect. The social world has its psychical suns, its spiritual planets, its satellites in every sphere of human activity and human intercourse. But genius—which is the supremest personal force in the world of thought—is a central sun of itself, back of which the essence of the unknowable rules and acts in mysterious, inscrutable, and eternal law.

FRANCIS GRIERSON.

MIDDLE-CLASS CULTURE FIFTY YEARS AGO.

WE have had comparisons enough and to spare between the beginning and the end of the past century, but such comparisons are necessarily devoid of personal testimony. Even if there are centenarians, which Thoms, editor of *Notes and Queries*, was disposed to question, could we expect to find one whose faculties were sufficiently vigorous to enable him to review the changes witnessed by him? Not to mention that he would have to number ten or fifteen years over the five score in order to appreciate the entire century *en connaissance de cause*. Many of us, on the other hand, can look back fifty years with unimpaired recollections. I was just old enough when the second half of the nineteenth century commenced to take note of the ideas and habits which prevailed in middle class society in a small East Anglian town, ninety miles from London, in which I then lived, in the neighbouring villages where I visited kinsfolk, and in the county town to which I removed. I may be mistaken, but it seems to me that no half century in English annals has been marked by so great a transformation of opinions and beliefs.

To begin with optimism. There was a general conviction in 1851 that great wars had almost or entirely ceased. After the storms of 1848, which were a series of local upheavals, not a Continental war, representative institutions were gaining ground, and it was believed that as our past wars had been mostly dynastic, self-governing peoples would never rush to arms. The Hyde Park Exhibition was regarded as a symbol of an era of universal peace.¹ But very few of my fellow-townsmen, indeed, went up to see it, albeit a railway had recently been opened; and here I may mention that we of the rising generation had watched with the greatest interest the construction of that railway, and that one of my cousins, a youth of eighteen, was looked upon not only by us but by his elders as very daring in mounting the locomotive which made the trial trip to the next

¹ "This is the first morning since the Creation that all peoples have assembled from all parts of the world and done a common act. Happily that act is an act of peace, of love, and of religion."—*Times*, May 1, 1851.

market town. Yet though few saw the Crystal Palace (it was for a time spelt with an *h*, chrystal), everybody talked of it, and pictures of it were to be seen everywhere. It was an age of optimism. Charles Mackay under its inspiration wrote *There's a Good Time Coming*, and people thought that the good time, if it had not actually arrived, was close at hand. I had a slight acquaintance with Mackay twenty years later, when he was doing hack-work, unworthy of his abilities, for the *Standard*. I fear he was a disappointed man. In any case he lived to see his song an anachronism, to see Europe and America convulsed with great wars, and to see a wave of pessimism sweep over the world. Another popular piece of verse, I forget the name of the author, had for its refrain, "Ideas will conquer swords," and there was a firm persuasion that right must overcome night. I do not find that persuasion to be general now. But the fifties were the golden age of faddists and enthusiasts. Phonetic spelling was thought to be in the way of adoption; Isaac Pitman even started a scheme of duodecimal numeration; phrenology had many adherents; vegetarianism was making proselytes; and humanitarians advocated the abolition of capital punishment, the principal objection which they had to meet being the verse in the Pentateuch, "Whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed."

Closely allied with the belief in the good time coming was the expectation of the end of the world. People studied Daniel and the Apocalypse to ascertain the approach of the millennium, by which was meant, at least in the evangelical circles in which I was brought up, not the steady diminution of human ills but the thousand years reign of the saints and the Second Advent. The usual, if not the only, objection then urged to the imminence of the consummation of all things was that the lost ten tribes must first be discovered, and that the Jews must be restored to the Holy Land. It was also a debated question whether the Pope was Antichrist. Dr. Cumming was then at the height of his fame, and his books had a large circulation, but his prophetic pretensions were shared by almanacks, Old Moore's and Zadkiel's, which were to be found in almost every household. Their political forecasts commanded considerable credence, although their daily weather predictions, so constantly belied by events, were rapidly losing caste. The changes of the moon were believed, however, to determine the weather. Another way of reading the future was to open the Bible at random on New Year's morning, and the text on which your thumb rested portended your destiny in the coming year. Dreams were not much heeded, but presentiments had importance, and very few people ventured to sit down thirteen to dinner for fear of dying within the year, albeit reasoners were beginning to explain that one in

thirteen was something like the ordinary rate of mortality. Nor would many have set out on a journey or transacted business of consequence on a Friday.

Omens were still generally believed in. So, too, were charms. I had a cousin who seriously undertook to charm away warts, and was believed to have succeeded. She was supposed to have inherited the secret from her father, a Wesleyan minister. My uncle, a farmer, and by no means a credulous man, when about to visit London for the first time, and feeling some trepidation, consulted a doctor, who, I believe, is still living, the last surviving schoolfellow of the famous George Borrow. The doctor handed him a small vial of quicksilver, as certain, if kept in the pocket, to avert all harm. Doubtless the doctor laughed in his sleeve, for doctors were then getting incredulous, and I remember it being commonly said of another practitioner that he believed neither in God nor devil. Nearly twenty years later, when a cousin who, born a Wesleyan, had turned Quaker and came up to London to the annual gathering of that body, he showed me, with a smile, the identical vial of mercury. His mother, good soul, had borrowed it from her brother so that her son might likewise benefit by it.

Doctors, by the way, enjoyed much more implicit credence than nowadays, and they probably had more faith in themselves, for in this, as in many other departments, increased knowledge means increased knowledge of our ignorance. Nobody would then have spoken of medicine, law, and divinity, as I now hear them described, as the three inexact sciences. Doctors, however, had formidable rivals. I need not mention the vogue of Holloway's pills. I remember so-called galvanic rings being worn by many people as a cure for nervousness. There was also a mysterious malady called the spleen, for which I was operated on by a wise woman who had come up from a neighbouring village to wait on patients. She made a slight incision on the back of my ear, so that some drops of blood oozed out, and with these she daubed a cross on my forehead, which was not to be washed off for some days. What symptoms I had given of the spleen, or why my sisters were not also operated upon, I cannot recollect. One of them, however, in order to get rid of an enlargement of the throat, was taken to a neighbour's house where an inmate lay dead, and the hand of the corpse was drawn across her throat. There was also a conviction that ear-rings cured or prevented ophthalmia. The divining rod was habitually employed in sinking wells.

Ghosts were, of course, almost universally believed in, though scarcely anybody professed to have seen one. I was never afraid of them, and I have been told that an elder sister, timid at going upstairs in the dark, used to take me with her to give her courage. I lived when from seven to eleven years of age in a house looking

out on a churchyard, and I certainly thought that ghosts flitted at night about such spots, so that I should probably have shrunk from passing through them unaccompanied, but I never felt any fear of the house being haunted. Yet I devoured the account of the Epworth ghost in Adam Clarke's *Memoirs of the Wesley Family*, and I did not question the preternatural character of the raps. When I discarded the belief I am unable to specify. As Channing says, and as Lecky has said after him, people renounce superstitions not by being argued out of them but by insensibly assimilating other notions with which they are incompatible. Among the rising generation I find ghosts to be as extinct as the dodo. Spiritualism—I remember its first appearance—made little way in England because it came ten or fifteen years too late, when the belief in ghosts was fast declining.

The "theological thaw" had not set in, and religious intolerance was still strong. The legendary verse of a hymn, though not yet invented, would have embodied a widespread sentiment:

"We are the choice, selected few,
Let all the rest be damned;
There's room enough in Hell for you.
We won't have Heaven crammed."

And Wesleyans sang without a qualm a quatrain, now, in their revised hymn book, shunted to the second verse and probably never sung:

"Into a world of ruffians sent,
I tread on hostile ground,
Where human bears, on slaughter bent,
And ravening wolves abound."

The bishops year after year threw out the Jew Bill, and even the House of Commons, which regularly sent it up to them, would have shrunk from admitting a Bradlaugh without taking the oath. Indeed a litigant, nay a criminal, could get rid of a damaging witness by challenging his belief in the sanctity of an oath. Oxford and Cambridge still required graduates to sign the Thirty-nine Articles, and I remember Lord Salisbury, then Lord Cranborne, heading, as late as 1866, the opposition to the abolition of this test, though it is but fair to add that I also remember hearing him assent to the Bill as inevitable. He endeavoured, it is true, while admitting Nonconformists to degrees, to exclude agnostics by a declaration of theism; but his fellow peers (he had then acceded to the Upper House) wisely rejected this last shred of intolerance. I recollect hearing a newly-elected mayor of my county town, a strenuous opponent of the Established Church, make the statutory declaration that he would do nothing to injure it. This was a remnant of the Test and Corporation Acts which had not yet been

destroyed, and which Sir Cornwall Lewis, when Home Secretary under Palmerston, half-heartedly defended. Bigotry or narrow-mindedness, call it what you will, was not, however, confined to churchmen. When an aged banker, universally respected, died in our little town, my mother remarked to her brother-in-law that surely so excellent a man must have gone to Heaven. My uncle, a Wesleyan, shook his head at the idea of the salvation of a Unitarian. Yet he himself some years later became one, and the banker's nephew and co-religionist, who had given the town a corn exchange, was presented with his portrait at a dinner at which a clergyman and a Baptist pastor responded to the toast of "ministers of religion of all denominations." Such was the change which ten or twelve years had effected. Unitarians, by the way, were then not unfrequently styled Socinians by people who would have been puzzled to explain who Socinus was.

The Church of England then annually commemorated King Charles the Martyr, and I do not remember that Nonconformists were ruffled at this observance, though they would twit the Establishment with giving thanks on May 29 for the restoration of the Stuarts and on November 5 for their expulsion. Carlyle's rehabilitation of Cromwell had not yet obtained much influence. Indeed, one of the Protector's descendants, Bishop Pelham of Norwich, down to his death in 1894, though liking to talk of his ancestry, studiously ignored Cromwell, whose New Testament, however, was a relic valued by his brother, the Earl of Chichester. "Respectable" people, almost without exception, then attended church or chapel. I had an uncle, a yeoman, who had discontinued going to church—he also required the omission of the cursing psalms in the daily family readings¹—but he was a solitary abstainer in his parish, whereas I am now told by a friend in the same district that he himself is the only farmer in his village who attends. The women folk usually stayed at home on the Sunday morning to prepare the dinner, but went to church in the afternoon. Farmers collected at the door discussing weather and crops till the parson's arrival, and after exchanging salutations with him filed into the church. The service was, of course, a dialogue between parson and clerk, and the old fashioned three-decker structures existed, the top storey reserved for the sermon, which was invariably delivered in a black gown. There was some talk, indeed, of Puseyites, but it was a distant rumbling. The clergy in my district (the elderly ones wore knee breeches and shoes with buckles) were either evangelical or what would now be called high-and-dry, as in that Suffolk village where Mrs. Carlyle found the squire accustomed to reading a novel in his high pew during the delivery

¹ My schoolmistress excluded Solomon's Song from the daily Scripture reading, yet the belief in its spiritual meaning was still almost universal, and her aged father gave his family a chapter every morning without even missing genealogies.

of his son's sermon. Boys who took a walk on Sunday afternoons felt themselves to be sinners, though it was allowable for farmers to saunter in their fields, and I remember signing in common with my elders a petition to Parliament against some railway company being required to run trains on Sundays.

I have spoken of bigotry, yet in villages the demarcation between Church and Dissent, or at least between Church and Methodism, was less sharp than now. There were families who went to church in the morning but to chapel in the evening, for the sake of a second sermon when the church was closed, nor did the clergy resent this divided allegiance.¹ Ministers of religion, on the other hand, felt much less latitude within their respective communions than at present. In my county town a church clergyman and a Unitarian pastor had seceded, and carrying a large portion of their congregations with them, had opened chapels unconnected with any denomination.² It seems to me that these sporadic communities, which used to swell the list of sects in *Whitaker's Almanack*, are less common nowadays.

In the smaller towns, where several Nonconformist chapels existed, the American practice, so amusingly described in Laboulaye's *Paris en Amérique*, of different members of a family marching off to various places of worship, would have excited amazement. I had a cousin, indeed, who, when advanced in his teens, went to the Independent chapel and joined the choir, in lieu of going with the rest of the family to the Wesleys, but this was an exception much commented upon, the father being generally considered lax in assertion of parental authority. Families then held more closely together not merely in life but in death. People were anxious to be buried beside their relatives, and even twenty years ago I heard of a lady who thought it a great comfort to her aunt to be buried along with an infant grand-niece. Cremation would in those days have occasioned unbounded horror. There were a few idle young fellows who kept away from church or chapel, but it was not from scepticism. They themselves knew it to be wicked. There were, moreover, already "lapsed masses," among whom a Scripture reader was set to work. An avowed sceptic, however, was a rare phenomenon. I remember but one among my kinsfolk. He was a lawyer, and his grandfather, as Dr. Jessopp has mentioned, witnessed the entrance of Charles II. into London. That grandfather was born about 1650, married late

¹ Lady Augusta Bruce, afterwards wife of Dean Stanley, when visiting her father in Paris about this period, "sat under" the Wesleyan minister William Arthur on Sunday evenings.

² George Dawson, of Birmingham, quitting the Baptists, in like manner erected the "Church of the Saviour." The local tradition is that when asked what would become of his large congregation at his death, he replied, "Half will join the Church and the other half will go to the devil." I believe his immediate successor joined the Church.

in life, and had a son born about 1720, who did likewise, so that the grandson was born about 1790.

Retribution was firmly believed in. "Ill-gotten goods never prosper," was a familiar saying, and an old man was thought to have shown great sagacity in foreseeing that a fortune unscrupulously acquired would be squandered by his descendants. I knew a poor girl subject to epileptic fits, who was told by her otherwise affectionate father, a Wesleyan lay preacher, that these must be a punishment for some secret sin. But her aunt, a farmer's wife, resembling Mrs. Poyser in sententiousness, on hearing of the cruel remark exclaimed, "More likely a punishment for *his* sin."

Penny postage had been ten years in operation, but the arrival or despatch of a letter was still an event, and stamps were invariably called "Queen's heads." Small book clubs existed, but a daily newspaper was almost an unknown luxury, and the weekly paper cost from 3½d. to 6d., there being a stamp duty of a penny and a paper duty, besides a 2s. 6d. duty on every advertisement. Several persons would join in taking a weekly journal. With the exception of the *Family Herald*, magazines were also seldom seen, though *Chambers' Journal* had existed since 1832, and Dickens had started *Household Words*, until John Cassell established the *Working Man's Friend*, a penny weekly, and Mr. Passmore Edwards the *Public Good*, a twopenny monthly. It was a feather in his cap, and the talk of the town, when a clerk to the railway contractor got a short article inserted in the latter. The clerk ultimately became a Unitarian minister, first I think at Swindon and then in London. He visited America in order to be cured of some chronic malady by a healing medium named Newton, and he returned full of enthusiasm. Indeed, I fancy he supposed himself to have acquired the gift. Before leaving our town he had "boxed the compass" by joining in turn the various sects, and I have an impression that I witnessed his immersion by the Baptists.

Newspapers and reviews being thus scarce,¹ lectures played a great rôle. Henry Vincent and Thomas Cooper² gave what they styled "orations" on historical subjects, and several of our townsmen drove out five miles to hear the former pooh-pooh P'apal aggression. A little later on, George Dawson gave his chatty and humorous biographical sketches, which did good service in their day by diffusing new ideas, and Dickens and Thackeray had their readings. Mrs. Clara Lucas Balfour, mother, I think, of the fraudulent bankrupt, was another popular lecturer. There were also temperance addresses, at which people were invited to ascend the platform and sign the

¹ But book-pedlars supplied country people with histories of the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny, in shilling parts; other pedlars hawked finery, and would represent silk goods as cheap because smuggled.

² Befriended by Disraeli in 1844 as the author of the prison-written poem the *Purgatory of Suicides*.

pledge.¹ There was even an anti-tobacco lecturer, named Reynolds, the agent of some society in London, whose bills were headed, "Smoke not, snuff not, chew not, why not." Yet smoking was then the exception among adults, and quite unknown among boys, except that you occasionally heard of a youth who had tried a clay pipe—cigarettes and even meerschaums were not yet introduced—with direful results. A man, styling himself Parallax (his real name was Rowbotham), went about demonstrating that the earth was flat (as Mr. Kruger still holds), the sun revolving round it, and he made at least for a time some proselytes. Indeed, he was more than a match in argument for the pundits of our country town unskilled in polemics, and I remember a future mayor exclaiming, when they had retired in confusion, "The old school have gone out." A trip was made to the sea, Parallax in one cab, his Copernican gainsayers in another, to ascertain whether on account of the dip of the horizon the hulls of passing ships disappeared before the masts. Both parties returned convinced of their own opinion. This reminds me that a worthy solicitor and coroner at Oxford, of all places, used to assure me, as recently as 1866, that the earth was a planosphere. Mormonites were also active, securing disciples for the Salt Lake, and to counteract them a so-called "Mormon-killer" had to be sent for. In the county town, moreover, freethinkers, secularists as they styled themselves, would engage Holyoake or Bradlaugh—he assumed the name of Iconoclast, because the London solicitor to whom he was clerk was afraid of losing clients if known to employ him—and Thomas Cooper, an ex-sceptic, or a Dr. Brindley would be brought down to controvert them, the result being public disputations which were very unedifying, and made no converts on either side. Two local antagonists also discussed, but with more calmness, Sunday observance. I doubt whether such tournaments would now attract large and sometimes excited audiences. Another instance of the interest in theological problems occurs to me. An Independent (afterwards a Unitarian) minister, Panton Ham, issued tracts which denied the "disembodied state," maintaining that conscious existence was suspended from death to the Last Judgment. He made, as far as I know, but one family of converts in our town, yet the question was much discussed, and texts *pro* and *con* were glibly quoted. When late in the sixties I heard Baldwin Brown, in a London suburban chapel, argue that the soul at death parted for ever with its body, I found but slight interest taken in the matter even by the rigidly orthodox.

Darwinism has insensibly modified theological beliefs. I remember its first appearance, and the derision or horror excited by it, as also by *Essays and Reviews*. A friend of mine witnessed and related to

¹ A strong but unavailing effort was made to exclude intoxicating drinks from the Sydenham Crystal Palace.

me the memorable encounter at Oxford in 1860 between Bishop Wilberforce and Huxley, an encounter at which, unfortunately, no stenographer was present. I heard, however, four years later, in the same city the famous speech in which Disraeli, ridiculing Broad Churchism, said—"The question has been raised, is man an ape or an angel? My lord"—turning with a flourish of his arm to Wilberforce—"I am on the side of the angel."¹

To speak of a thing as un-English, in the fifties and sixties, was to condemn it without appeal. The ballot was for thirty years thus disposed of, and I remember hearing the late Sir John Mowbray trot out the well-worn passage from Sydney Smith, describing how a man would thus eat the wrong dinners, drink the wrong toasts, and practise, in short, systematic deception. Thackeray, when a Radical candidate for Oxford in 1859, though promising to support the ballot, said: "We are too manly for that at present." His successful opponent, Cardwell, then an avowed opponent of the measure, lived to be a member of the Cabinet which proposed and carried it. Who would now go back to the system of outdoor nominations, with their uproar and rotten eggs, of wearing "favours," and of hourly statements of the poll, with the consequent inducement to venality? The example of our colonies did much to dispel the prejudice against the ballot. Travelling, moreover, has made us cosmopolitan. We no longer believe that everything British is right and everything foreign wrong. We are not above taking lessons from our neighbours. Rightly or wrongly, we were all "Little Englanders" then. Nobody foresaw extensions of territory in India, much less in Africa; Lord Derby was unanimously approved in 1858 for rejecting Rajah Brooke's offer of Sarawak; and the colonies, it was generally believed, would declare themselves independent, like ripe fruit dropping from the parent tree.

Few of my fellow townsmen in the fifties had beheld the sea,² though it was only twenty miles distant; and when several young men went to Australia to try their fortune at the gold diggings they were considered phenomenally adventurous. I am sure that not one inhabitant of the town had been as far as Paris. Nowadays even the artisan takes a trip thither. Yet an old soldier among us had served at St. Helena during Napoleon's captivity, but whether from his taciturnity or public indifference I never heard of this till many years afterwards, when a new rector appealed in the *Times* for subscriptions for him.

A great change has come over village sentiment in my time. The parson and the squire are no longer looked up to with awe. The church, as we have seen, has thin congregations, and the squire has

¹ Not "angels," as in the newspaper reports.

² But all had heard of the maelstrom, which was classed with Niagara, among the wonders of the world, just as William Tell was classed with Joan of Arc.

in many cases been compelled by the fall in rents to shut up his mansion or let it to a London *parvenu*. And just as the farmer has become independent of the landlord, so the labourer has become independent of the farmer. The extension of the franchise has taught the peasantry the power of numbers, and in my county, where up to the seventies a Liberal candidate stood no chance, five divisions out of six return Liberals; yet, on the other hand, the county town, for nearly a century a stronghold of Liberalism, elects Conservatives without a contest. But the change in the towns is merely political, in the villages it is social. Titles have lost much of their respect. A lord is no longer regarded as a superior being. Democracy has come in like a flood, and even if peers do not figure more frequently than of yore in bankruptcy or divorce cases the misdeeds of the black sheep of the aristocracy now attain much greater publicity. I have no recollection of the possessions of any old or noble family in my county down to the seventies coming to the hammer. And just as respect for rank has declined, respect for money, and for anything that brings money, has increased. In the towns trade has gained caste. Half a century ago it was looked down upon as degrading by professional men and by the gentry. Even the London merchant sniffed superciliously at the retail tradesman. The feeling scarcely exists now, when titled men engage in business, and when an occupation is judged by its receipts.

There has been levelling up as well as levelling down. A piano in the fifties was never seen in a farmhouse, nor did middle-class families ever talk of a "drawing-room." I recollect the amusement of an old-fashioned housekeeper, on the sale of her deceased master's furniture, at finding the auctioneer convert the "sitting-" or "keeping"-room into a dining-room, and the "parlour" into a drawing-room. I am not sure that a farm maid-servant even now would have her letters addressed "Miss,"¹ but we all know that in towns that title is universal. It is scarcely necessary to speak of the disappearance of distinctive costumes. The Quaker dress, male and female, has disappeared in my time, along with the ungrammatical *thee* for the second person singular, and the styling of days and months by numbers in lieu of pagan appellations. Garments are, of course, much less durable now. A "great-coat" used to last a farmer a lifetime, and a gingham umbrella served for several generations.

I might mention the progress of sanitation (we used to drink water without fear of microbes), the rise of "muscular Christianity" and the Volunteer movement, the avidity for education and examinations, the afternoon teas (callers did not formerly expect refreshments), the

¹ In the fifties she would probably have been unable to read or write a letter, and I knew an otherwise enlightened man who had objected to the erection of a British school on the ground that education was not good for the lower orders.

comparative desertion of Consols as investments, even by old maids, who have consequently learnt a smattering of the money market, and the opening up to young women of medicine, journalism, and type-writing, thus rendering them less dependent on parents or brothers. But I have said enough to show what social changes have taken place during the past half century. The changes, assuredly, are not all for the better—the increase of betting is a glaring instance to the contrary—and does not Amiel, the Geneva philosopher, define progress as advance on a hundred points and retrogression on ninety-nine? Yet who would seriously think of turning back the clock?

J. G. ALGER.

SOME NOTES ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

FOR educational purposes, the United States are not a country but a group of countries, and the systems are as numerous and as various as the methods of land assessment in India. What is true of one State need not be true of another; and a description that applies to the Eastern States may not apply to those of the South and West. For this reason it is by no means easy to draw an accurate picture of education in the United States within brief compass.

Since the beginning of American history, New England has been in the van of the educational movement; and among the States of New England, Massachusetts has throughout held the foremost place. Before the earliest settlers had passed two decades in their new home, a complete framework of education had been constructed. Elementary education was declared compulsory, elementary schools were ordered to be created in every township, secondary or grammar schools were instituted at Boston and the principal towns, and the earliest American university was endowed by Harvard. This remarkable outburst of zeal did not, however, continue more than one or two generations, and the eighteenth century was a time of comparative torpor in New England, while in the Southern States no public schools whatever existed. It was not till the closing years of the century that a stirring of the embers began with the introduction of the ideas of Lancaster, and other teachers of the Old World.

The author of the educational revival in America, the lawgiver of the movement which has gone irresistibly forward since his death and has now passed beyond the danger of reaction, was Horace Mann. Appointed Secretary to the newly created Massachusetts Board of Education in 1838, Mann immediately began to carry out a series of far-reaching changes, of which only the more important need be mentioned. He founded Normal Colleges for the training of teachers, excluding sectarian instruction from public schools, induced the State to allocate public money to educational purposes, insisted on expert inspection, raised the scale of salaries, introduced

the practice of oral discussion in class, insisted on appropriate buildings and equipment, founded school libraries, visited Prussia to study the latest theory and practice, and by delivering lectures, drawing up circulars, and issuing a careful yearly Report on the achievements and requirements of the Board, aroused universal interest in education and effected an intellectual rebirth in the State. When Mann resigned his post after twelve years, he had the satisfaction of witnessing a general revival of the common schools, and of knowing that his ideas had been already carried out by his greatest disciple, Henry Barnard, in Connecticut and Rhode Island, and were being discussed in every State of the Union. Mann occupies a unique position in educational history. He was more to America than was Humboldt to Prussia, Guizot to France, or Forster to England.

Not long after Mann quitted education for politics, the Federal Government took two steps of considerable importance. In the first place, grants of land, extending over an area larger than Great Britain, and worth over sixty millions sterling, were set aside by Congress as a permanent endowment for education. And secondly, a Central Bureau of Education was established in 1867, which, though possessing neither legislative nor administrative powers, has acted as an immense stimulus. By its annual Report, and in other ways, it has helped to make the more backward parts of the Union acquainted with the results obtained in the more progressive and successful. The Federal Government controls the agricultural experiment stations, the military and naval academies, and the schools for Indians. With these exceptions, education is exclusively within the competence of the several States.

It is impossible to describe in general terms the machinery of education. In some States almost the whole is retained in the hands of the Government; in others, the State does little more than fill up gaps that are left by private institutions. In some States education is compulsory; in others it is not. A few, like New York, employ a highly centralised form of administration; others, like Massachusetts, prefer to leave almost entire control in the hands of the local authorities. Even where the framework appears identical, the composition of the governing bodies may differ very widely.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

Beginning at the bottom of the ladder, we find that it is the rapid industrial development of the country that has made a comprehensive system of elementary education feasible. The rural schools which, a generation ago, included the great majority of such children as received any education at all, contain to-day less than half the total number of scholars, and constitute the only part of the network of

institutions that remains radically unsatisfactory. In the south and west the population is often so scattered that compulsory education is found impossible. The village school, sometimes containing as few as twenty children, can rarely boast of a properly trained teacher. The salary is so small and the dearth of society so complete, that the experienced or highly educated teacher naturally refuses to have anything to do with it. The children are in consequence taught by a single teacher, without serious attempt at classification. The distance between town and country schools, great as it is in England, is vastly greater in America.

When we come to deal with the towns, we find ourselves in the presence of a singularly complete organisation. Kindergartens, which were introduced into Boston by wealthy Froebelian enthusiasts, are now, in the majority of cases, public institutions. The latest feature in this connection is the establishment of a department for mothers.

In the town or township elementary schools, more than half the teachers are professionally educated and in the larger schools everything works with the precision of a machine. Foreign observers indeed are struck by the almost military discipline imposed, the children, for instance, entering and leaving the room in order. Yet corporal punishment is exceedingly rare, and its diminution has run parallel with the reduction in the size of classes.

The method of teaching in elementary schools differs in one important particular from the German and from our own. The instruction is conveyed almost exclusively by text-book. It is quite true that the constant handling of books enables the child to learn to master the printed page at a glance, while orally instructed children feel themselves bewildered when a volume is placed in their hands; but the practice is almost universally condemned on account of its tendency to develop memory at the expense of the imagination and reasoning powers. Text-book memorising, however, is beginning to yield to discussion and analysis in the large schools, not a little in consequence of the vigorous protests on the part of Herbartian writers and teachers.

Though the age of attendance varies in almost every State, the usual limits are seven and fourteen; but Maine retains its children till fifteen, New York, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut till sixteen. The course, however, is often shortened if the child is needed for labour, or lengthened if he is illiterate and idle. Compulsory attendance is practically universal in the towns. The number of weeks in the year during which a child must attend school varies greatly, in Kentucky falling as low as eight. This, of course, allows a wide margin for half-timers, and many States permit the employment of children of a certain age only when the schools are not in session. Clothing is provided for needy children in three States.

In passing to organisation, we meet differences as wide as in reference to attendance and school age. In almost every State we find the school district (the area served by a village school), which is controlled by the resident political voters, who appoint from among their numbers "trustees" or "directors." These districts are, of course, often exceedingly small, and Illinois, for instance, possesses over 12,000 of them. In certain States we meet with the greatly superior township system, or group of scattered villages, which is usually administered by a Board chosen by the political voters, and regulating the elementary schools within the area. In New England the Township Board is virtually supreme, determining the rules of the school and controlling the salary, appointment, and dismissal of teachers. In certain States, above all in the south, we are introduced to the County System, the State being divided into counties for purposes of local administration. A Board of Education is chosen by the Grand Jury, by the justices of the peace, or in a city by popular election. The county superintendent and the city superintendent are rarely popularly elected, but are appointed by the State or county officials, or by the combined vote of the School Boards. At the head of all is the State Superintendent, and in many cases a State Board. In the highly centralised State of New York the State Superintendent possesses the powers of a Dictator, the finance is controlled from the centre, and the cities contribute to the expense of the country districts. In the majority of States it is safe to say that the trend is towards conferring greater power on the central authority; and it need not be pointed out how powerfully the institution of State training colleges and of expert supervision contributes to extend its influence.

In connection with the curriculum in elementary schools, we may note that no other nation devotes so much time to arithmetic or so much attention to its own history. During the last one or two years of the elementary course, the child receives instruction in the history of the United States; and during the closing months of the last year, the Constitution and the political life of the Union are fully explained. Some schools adopt the French practice of giving instruction in "civics." Drawing and manual training are becoming general, and in Massachusetts, ever a pioneer, they are already universal.

With few exceptions, the elementary schools are frequented and taught by both sexes, the wide employment of female teachers being due in part to the exigencies of the situation created by the Civil War, when education was necessarily carried on by women.

The most recent and perhaps the most potent influence brought to bear on elementary education, at any rate in the upper Mississippi valley, is that of Herbart, whose ideas—as developed by his greatest disciples, Ziller and Rein—began to take root in America some ten

years ago. A Herbart Club was founded, translations were made from German works, and text-books of the highest value are now being composed by Americans. The effect of the Herbartian invasion has been distinctly beneficial. Its adherents lay stress on the unity of knowledge and the consequent correlation of studies, building up knowledge round a "core" of history, literature, and science, and basing the study of the past on the recognition of "culture epochs." Their opposition to the mechanical use of the text-book, and their insistence on the importance of the development of "apperception" has already been referred to. Scarcely less fruitful has been the influence of G. Stanley Hall, of Clark University, who works along somewhat different lines to the same end, namely, the enrichment of pedagogy by psychology.

SECONDARY EDUCATION.

On turning to Secondary Education, we find the same tendency to supplement or supersede private endeavour by public endowment and public control. About the time of the War of Independence, the private "academy" made its appearance, and for more than half a century provided most of the secondary instruction that was available. The great majority of the academies were founded and controlled by different religious bodies, and, indeed, were largely modelled on the "dissenting academies" of which we hear so much in the England of the eighteenth century. Benjamin Franklin's unsectarian foundation in Philadelphia had few imitators. Despite the obvious weaknesses of the academies, America owes them a signal debt for having introduced a wider outlook and higher standard of culture than prevailed in the older grammar schools. Some were also established for girls, and not a few admitted both sexes.

Early in the last century several States began to make grants to certain of the academies, without attempting to establish any control. This step, joined to the growing sense of the importance of education, led to a widespread demand for public unsectarian secondary schools. The first step was taken, as so often before and after, in Massachusetts, and the first public high school was founded by Boston in 1821. At the outbreak of the Civil War, public secondary schools were in existence in every part of the Union. Some of the academies were closed; some voluntarily metamorphosed themselves into public institutions. On the other hand, many remain, and are filled by children of parents who desire for them a definitely religious atmosphere during their school life, or who are compelled to send their children to a boarding-school. It seems probable, moreover, that the academies will, for a long time, find a number of recruits among the children of rich parents who desire

that the schoolmates should be drawn exclusively from the aristocracy of wealth. The employment of a resident private instructor in rich families appears to be growing common.

The ideal of education in the United States is to spend eight years at an elementary school, four at a secondary school, and four at a college. We saw in outline how the time was spent in the elementary schools; how is it spent here? In answering the question, we may make the preliminary remark that classical studies find more place in the private than in the public schools. In the latter Greek is not largely taught, and it may be questioned whether the study of Latin is pursued with the eagerness devoted to other subjects. The idea of passing to college was not part of the intention of the earliest High Schools; but the course of study has in recent years become largely governed by the entrance requirements of the colleges. In many cases this influence has been found almost paralysing, and has led to various attempts to establish a relation which will guarantee the highest interests of both. By the "Accrediting System," introduced in Michigan in 1871, and adopted by many States, pupils of public or publicly inspected schools may, under certain conditions, enter college without an examination. The college or university satisfies itself that the school applying for recognition is properly taught. In other words, it is the school, rather than the individual, that is examined, and, if approved, is accredited for two or three years. Though this system in some cases fosters a disposition to dispense with all tests of accurate scholarship, it is generally recognised as a step in advance. In New England, similarly, "School and College Associations" have spontaneously arisen to discuss the relation of the secondary and higher curricula.

No subject connected with secondary schools has excited, and still excites, such prolonged discussion as to when the process of specialisation should begin. On entering one of the older academies, the student chooses between a classical and a modern course. This, however, appears to many both too narrow and too wide, and the practice is becoming common in High Schools of spending some time in general study before electing between classics and science, and when the choice is made, taking some particular science or sciences, or some special branch of knowledge. Both systems, the elective and the parallel, are, however, tending to become, to some extent, similar, for both are in constant process of modification. The parallel system is becoming widened, and endeavours are being made to guard against the undue dispersion of force, which constitutes the danger of unrestricted election. In many schools we find the ideal adumbrated in Mill's Rectorial Address realised, the pupils paying careful attention to classics and science alike. Another integrating factor is the study of English; but history is too much neglected,

the excuse being that it is sufficiently taught in the elementary schools.

The organisation of secondary education cannot be shortly described, for the reasons already referred to in connection with elementary education. New England leads the way here, as in every part of the educational field. Massachusetts, for instance, compels every town or township—in other words the whole country—to provide free secondary schooling. Where a district is thinly populated scholars must be provided with money to attend the nearest school. Of single States, New York is the best organised, every secondary school being regarded as a department of the University and supervised and examined by the Regents. In large towns evening High Schools exist in considerable numbers.

We must class under secondary education the "Commercial Schools" and Colleges, which are at present, for the most part, private institutions, though public schools are being founded in great numbers. In many of the ordinary High Schools, moreover, "business courses" in book-keeping, commercial law, arithmetic, history, geography, and banking are being organised.

On leaving the secondary school the student usually goes to a college, to a theological seminary, or to one or other of the professional schools, such as law or medicine, attached to the larger universities. To take the colleges first, we must remember that the word possesses different meanings in different parts of the Union, and often within the limits of a single State. But it is broadly true to say that the ordinary American college supplies education that is partly secondary and partly higher, though the former aspect of its work is less pronounced to-day than some years ago, when students entered at fifteen or sixteen, instead of eighteen. The student often spends one or two years at secondary work. In some colleges he may elect for a certain study, or group of studies, on entrance; in others not till his third year. This tendency to make the college in a certain sense a secondary continuation school is also evident in the frequent postponement of technical studies, such as engineering, till after graduation. The choice of advance studies is often limited by understaffing, where as few as six teachers are sometimes found, badly paid, and taking several subjects apiece. Of the newer institutions in the south and west, Mr. Bryce tells an amusing story of his meeting with the President of a Western College, who spoke grandly of the "Faculty," which he was ultimately forced to confess consisted of himself and his wife. In other words, at least three-quarters of the colleges are more elementary than Gymnasien and Lycées, and are practically secondary schools, differing in no way from them save by their privilege of granting degrees. There are far too many degree-giving institutions, and a concentration of forces seems urgently necessary—for instance, among

the fifty-seven colleges in Ohio and the twenty in Tennessee. On the other hand every college, however ill-equipped and insignificant, is a centre of enlightenment to its immediate locality. Moreover, the last few years have witnessed an extraordinary development in many of the younger States of the Union, and at this moment almost every Western State possesses at least one University of the first rank, with a highly paid staff and an ever-increasing roll of students.

In addition to the colleges, there are many scientific and technical institutions, some private, others affiliated to colleges or universities, others, again, supported and controlled by the State, as in Massachusetts.

Allied both to secondary schools and to colleges are the summer schools, commenced at Chautauqua, and now almost universal. Unlike University extension, which, at least in its English form, has met with but slight success, the summer courses are regarded rather as a supplement to than a substitute for systematic school and college life.

The brightest features in American education are the universal recognition of its importance, the earnest study of its conditions, the ungrudging supply of money from public and private sources, its cheapness, and the mixture of classes which it involves. Its greatest need has always been, and is to-day, for a larger number of efficient teachers.

G. P. GOOCH.

MAY A LAYMAN DISCUSS THE PROBLEM OF VIVISECTION ?

Few of us go through life without being met at some turn or other by the problem of vivisection.

When we are questioned as to the distance the sun is away from the earth we glibly utter a formula of figures, and rely wholly on astronomers as to whether or not they are right.

We are neither competent nor desirous to work out the problem for ourselves, and if any theological fanatic attempts to upset our faith, and to declare that these distances are impossible ones, we gently smile and bid him accept the opinion of those who alone are qualified to speak.

If any one attempts to argue with me that Argon is a myth, and that all the evidences for its existence are inconclusive, I can only reply, that I do not understand Chemistry well enough to be a competent judge, but that I do understand human nature well enough to be satisfied that chemists understand their business, and that I can trust their honesty—or their jealousy—enough to satisfy me absolutely that Argon does exist much in the way that they say it exists.

If then the layman accepts his creed about the distances of the sun and the stars, second-hand, from professional astronomers, and gives unquestionable adherence to the dicta of chemists as to the existence of obscure gases, should he not equally rightly place his doctor on a pinnacle on medical questions, and accept with equally childlike obedience the dicta of the medical profession upon the question of experiments tried upon animals ?

If it is scientific and fitting for the ignorant layman to defer to the opinion of the professional upon problems of Astronomy and Chemistry, is it not equally scientific and fitting for him to do so upon problems of Medicine ?

This is the tone of reasoning which is now largely adopted by medical advocates of the practice of vivisection. They take up the position that a doctor should not discuss with a layman, and that the opinion of a layman is an entirely negligible quantity upon such a question as vivisection. Laymen, however, are demanding to be heard. They are claiming the right to be heard. They are building up important societies, and are controlling large sums of

money, and are wielding great powers in the field of battle, and the arena upon which the contest is fought is this medical question of vivisection.

The problems before me then are these: Have laymen any right to discuss medical questions? Is vivisection a medical question? The first question may well be supposed to be answered by the analogy of the examples I have already quoted of astronomy and chemistry.

If a layman may not dispute the deductions of an astronomer, neither may he attempt to destroy the faith of the public in the dicta of the doctor.

Since vivisection is practised for the purpose of discovering remedies for the diseases of the human race, it comes within the realm of medical science, and it is for the doctor, therefore, and not for the layman, to deal with this subject. I confess that on the surface this appears to be a correct and a conclusive statement of the problem, but a little further examination shows that it is not exhaustive.

In the first place neither an astronomer nor a chemist becomes so by a State diploma after a minimum examination.

I suppose that any one who chose to study deeply the problems of astronomy could rightly be termed "an astronomer," and his conclusions would be accepted or rejected on their merits by other learned astronomers.

In astronomy and chemistry, as in all true sciences, graduation is by knowledge, and whether a man passes an examination set by other men, or whether he does not, or whether he draws a salary for working at or for teaching his subject, or whether he pursues knowledge for the love of it, it matters little or nothing. His discoveries or his deductions, or his opinions, are weighed according to their intrinsic value and according to his knowledge.

The reason, therefore, that I do not dispute the dicta of astronomers, is not because I am a layman as far as the professional practice of astronomy is concerned, but because I am ignorant on the subject of astronomy.

While, therefore, I agree to the analogy of medicine and astronomy it must be a true analogy and not a merely superficial one.

The ignorant layman may not dispute the dogmas of the learned physicians, but the ignorant physician must not ape a knowledge he does not possess by assuming that the State title to practise medicine is a hall-mark of some mysterious knowledge which a layman cannot obtain.

The fact of not possessing a State diploma may be presumptive evidence, but it is not conclusive evidence of ignorance on medical subjects.

It is not every man who wants to practise medicine, or to make a living out of his knowledge, who studies medicine any more than astronomical subjects.

The moment a man shows that he *has* studied medical subjects, and *does* understand the scientific matters in dispute, his opinion becomes at once worthy of consideration whether or not he has obtained the permission of the State to practise medicine. And the moment he shows that he does *not* understand, the fact that at some time or other he passed a State examination in a certain number of medical subjects is no excuse for his pretending to be exempt from the present necessity of intelligent comprehension.

Laymen, therefore, *qua* laymen, are not ineligible for discussing medical subjects in general, or vivisection in particular, but only ignorant men are ineligible for discussing subjects for which a special knowledge is requisite.

There is, however, another view of the subject wherein the ordinary analogy to the chemist or the astronomer is imperfect.

It is true that Galileo came into conflict with the Church over the question of the relative movements of the sun and the earth, but no one looking back on the controversy can suggest that any question of ethics or morality, or human progress, was involved in his conclusions.

The Church simply interpreting biblical figures baldly, crudely and literally, dogmatically condemned all who dared to think for themselves.

When to-day an arrogant Church attempts to enthrall men's minds and chain them down to sterile ignorance, the voice of science must ever stand up for the truth, for right and for liberty, but where the question of morality and ethics, and human progress is concerned, science knows that in its weighing of comparative values the value of character is greater than the value of knowledge, and that the problem of means is as important as the question of ends.

On the question of experimentation upon animals then we are in a different position to that in which disputants about astronomy or chemistry are placed.

In either of these, the methods and conclusions of scientific research may run counter to theologic dogmata, but science, rightly weighing values, recognises that theologic dogmata are, *qua* dogmata, of less value than accurate knowledge, and that the problems of astronomy and chemistry are strictly limited to the field of technical knowledge.

On the other hand, in the problem of animal experimentation, it is not theologic dogmata that are involved but the very basis problems of ethics.

Apart from Christianity, apart from Buddhism, apart from Mohammedanism, or apart from any other ism, the broad truth is

recognised by a catholic science that cruelty and the deliberate infliction of severe pain upon involuntary victims for a speculative purpose is inimical to the development of the higher character—the humaner character.

Now science, recognising that evolution is the greatest thing in the world, rightly weighs the humanising of character as of more importance than the attainment of knowledge.

The ethics of vivisection—or what may be called the *morality* of vivisection—is therefore of more importance in the eyes of science than the *utility* of vivisection?

For the discussion of ethics, no State diploma to practise medicine is of the slightest value—and this is why it is a scientific position to demand freedom for the man in the street to have his say upon the problem of experimentation of animals; and this is why they who maintain that the question is one for medicos only, and that it is presumption for the layman to dispute their dicta, are thereby convicted of being but pseudo disciples of that science on whose behalf they pretend to speak.

The layman, therefore, if educated technically, has the right to discuss the purely scientific side of this great problem, and the medico, even though he possess the State permit to practise medicine, is not thereby hall-marked as necessarily sufficiently learned to give a valuable opinion upon it.

The layman may be fully competent to discuss the ethical side of the problem, for the scientific studies of the medico are no essential preparation for an ability to discuss intelligently this—its most important basis.

I contend, therefore, that the claim made by a certain portion of the medical press that the layman has no *locus standi* in deciding whether vivisection shall or shall not be practised is eminently unscientific, and must never be allowed to pass unchallenged.

JOSIAH OLDFIELD.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AND DR. SCOTT TEBB.

IN answer to a question in Parliament by Mr. Corrie Grant on July 29 concerning the refusal of the Local Government Board to sanction the appointment of Dr. Scott Tebb as the Medical Officer of Health when elected by the Penge District Council, Mr. Long is reported to have said that "a profession of belief in vaccination was not required from persons before their appointment as medical officer of health was sanctioned, but in the event of an outbreak of small-pox it would devolve on the medical officer of health to promote vaccination and re-vaccination." Could any reply be more contradictory? What are the facts? Dr. Scott Tebb would now be medical officer of health of Penge had he not been the author of a work entitled "A Century of Vaccination," reviewed some time since in the influential pages of the *Westminster Review*. This treatise, of which a second edition is nearly exhausted, proves, by unimpeachable facts, the danger and futility of vaccination, and because it does so the author is penalised by the loss of his appointment. Is that not indirectly compelling a doctor who seeks the position of medical officer of health to profess a belief in vaccination? Then, again, vaccination and re-vaccination do not prevent small-pox; sanitation, in which Dr. Tebb is an acknowledged expert, does this, and with an enlightened and efficient medical officer of health, supported by local authorities, there would be no outbreak of small-pox. As long ago as 1853, the *Lancet*, an ardent advocate for vaccination, admitted: "In the public mind extensively, and, to a more limited extent, in the profession itself, doubts are known to exist as to the efficacy and eligibility of the practice of vaccination. The failures of the operation have been numerous and discouraging. It has failed frequently by producing no effect at all . . . it has failed in protecting persons so vaccinated from a future attack of small-pox." Epidemics of small-pox, it should be known, almost invariably commence with the vaccinated (as in the recent cases of Middlesbrough and Glasgow), who are thus constituted a source of peril to the unvaccinated. The great majority of small-pox patients have been vaccinated previously, and frequently more than once. With

regard to re-vaccination: In Egypt, from 1882 to 1895, there were 233 cases and 25 deaths from small-pox among the re-vaccinated troops, or an average annual attack rate of 8004, and a death-rate of 322 per million. In the Indian army, also re-vaccinated, during the same period, there were 691 cases and 68 deaths, the rates being 768 and 76 per million respectively; while unvaccinated Leicester, during those fourteen years, had only 446 cases and 29 deaths, the rates being 204 and 13 per million. This comparison is unfair to Leicester, seeing that the army is composed of picked men living at a comparatively insusceptible period of life.

The decision of Mr. Long in this matter is indefensible and absolutely mischievous, as it diverts attention from the real scientific preventive of personal and municipal cleanliness to the broken reed of a futile and dangerous process.

PUBLIC HEALTH.

THE TRAGEDY OF ARCHITECTURE.

PUBLIC appreciation of architecture might almost be described in one word, as *nil*; and, although such a conclusion would be most generally correct, it would ignore the flights of passing fancy and fashion in relation to the great building art. It is safe to say that there is no real public appreciation of architecture for the simple reason that it has ceased to be an art, and has developed into a fashion. And we don't appreciate a fashion; we admire it for a time, because it tickles our palate, it captivates our idiosyncrasies; then we let it die out and be forgotten. We have styles in architecture just as we have styles or fashions in dress, and the fluctuations of popular taste are as capricious in the one as in the other. The reign of fashion is one of the most arbitrary and senseless forms of government to which human beings have ever subjected themselves; all individuality is crushed, so that we go on blindly following some passing whim like a flock of sheep. And in architecture this despotism is no less idiotic and offensive than in dress. One style is in vogue now, then another, and so our buildings are erected first in this style and then that, all because we want something fresh; a change from the monotony of our everlasting streets—those hideous monuments of our latter-day civilisation. The question of variety in street architecture does not affect the contention that our buildings are erected in styles not because one particular mode is more suited to the nature and purposes of the erection, or better adapted for the climate, or even more nearly expressive of our modern civilisation and sense of refinement and culture. Then why? For the simple reason that "craze" must be pandered to, we must give evidence of an "improved" taste, and incidentally provide profitable work for the architect and for the labouring classes. Of course, it is the cloven foot of commercialism, and from a utilitarian standpoint it may be right, but morally and aesthetically is it right? It cannot be! The structure should be honestly expressed by the façade; it is what is behind which should suggest the front, which, after all, is but a screen to hide the interior. In modern construction what is behind does not seem to affect either the architect or the client; the building is, from the front, what it appears to be. But it isn't!

A house with an Italian front does not imply necessarily an Italian house, or one with a Moorish front anything appertaining to

the Moors. No! It may be that the interior is the most commonplace and prosaic; and it often is. The introduction of variety into architecture of course is commendable, but only where it is honest and expressive of the nature of the structure. It is worthy and welcome that our streets should have some diversity. Too-long they have been the nightmares of a pampered and petted conventionality. But surely when all thoughts of convenience, utility, and honest adaptability are thrown on one side in our effort to produce an eccentric line of façades, we have passed from the boundary of sense to absurdity.

Looked at from the point of view from which buildings are generally judged nowadays, it is a pity that such erections have to be put to any use. Could they only be arranged and taken care of in the precincts of some huge art gallery or museum, they would prove good specimens of human "effort," and be no longer the butt of the faultfinder and satirist. Then were this the object and end of the building designer, and houses built to look at and not to live in, architects and their clients would be at peace, and towers, turrets, façades, windows and doors could be designed without risk of causing inconvenience, ridicule and contention. But we live in a day when everything must be practical amongst the upper classes, as well as amongst the usually called "common people"; the practical man is dictator with a sway as influential as it is effectual. But, strange to say, that, as regards architecture, all sorts of incongruous things are permitted and even encouraged, evidently because they are the latest, most modern, smart, or up-to-date. Towers, turrets, battlements and mouldings are designed where unnecessary, windows where they are not needed, and ornament plastered on where it is absolutely meaningless and silly. Thus there is a constant series of squabbles between architect and client, builder and tenant. And it is to be expected that such *will* happen and continue to happen so long as this strange craving is pandered to.

The most elementary student of the history of architecture is aware that ornamentation and utility can be combined to produce the most perfect buildings. Then why should these essentials be separated? Without close combination no really successful building can be produced: nothing but a medley of inharmonious disorder.

There is a broad distinction between architecture and mere building construction. A building without art is simply construction, as a body is dead that is without life. John Ruskin, in his "Seven Lamps," says: "The creations of architecture, being not essentially composed of things pleasant in themselves, but of inert substance, depend for their dignity and pleasurable-ness, in the utmost degree, upon the vivid expression of the intellectual life which has been conceived in their production. Thus all things become noble, or ignoble, in proportion to the amount of energy of the mind

of man which has visibly been employed upon them." It would seem preposterous to enlarge on this, after an era of work by Ruskin, Morris, and others. But there are times when one almost thinks that they have lived in vain. Yet it cannot be!

It is the failure to realise the difference between construction and architecture which leads to the creation of these building *Frankensteins*, and the diffusion of such perverted views broadcast amongst the people. The true aim should be the proper combination of aesthetics with construction. A factory or warehouse, plain and unadorned, is not architectural. It may answer its purpose, for common needs, but that is not the point. There should be a rhythm or a kind of symbolism in its lines which will influence the thoughts of the observer, otherwise it will be a lifeless and inanimate object, deadening rather than elevating, depressing rather than invigorating. Again to quote Ruskin: "Architecture is the art which so disposes and adorns the edifices raised by man, for whatever uses, that the sight of them may contribute to his mental health, power and pleasure."

The story of architecture through all the ages has been the story of man's attempt to adapt his life to his environment. Indeed, it is the unwritten law of progress, and architecture has always been the reflex of national character. The Greeks gave the evidence of their almost superhuman fineness of intellect and taste in the architecture of their temple. They understood their art, with its balance of voids and solids, contrasts of light and shade, horizontal and vertical line, plain and decorated surfaces, subtlety of curves, exquisite proportions and precisions, &c. Therefore they succeeded. The Romans, apart from the Greek adaptations introduced by Dilettanti, exhibited their national feeling in the solidity and strength of their edifices—buildings reflecting the vastness of their empire, built not for a day but for all time, a symbol of Imperial destiny and Roman eternity.

The American Indian in his wigwam, the Assyrian in his house of clay, the Roman in his villa, and the man of the middle ages in his castle, are but types of civilisations influenced by climate, natural and geographical conditions, soil, land produce, temperature, rainfall, manner of living, &c., and evolving themselves into classes of society visibly expressed by their dwelling-places. The influence of environment on architecture is readily realised when we think of the reason why the Assyrian built of clay, the Greek of stone, and why the mediæval noble lived in a fortified palace. It was because of the abundance of clay in Assyria, of stone in Greece, and because of the unsettled state of the country in the middle ages, that such was the prevailing method in these various nationalities at their respective times.

As time progressed the economic and social influence of trade

and commerce was apparent, and felt by all sections of the people. Society was revolutionised by the vast changes taking place. The enforcement of law caused the disappearance of the old fortified dwellings, and a free, peaceable, social life was inaugurated which brought about small dwelling-places and villas instead of great huddled collections of houses under the protection of a citadel or fort.

Out of the diverse operations of natural conditions each architectural style originated and each form had an evolution of its own which was as distinct and as easily traced as progress in any other art or attainment. Common sense, truth, utility, and simplicity were the foundations upon which all the great phases of architecture of old were built; but they were disregarded, and one by one thrown to the winds with reckless *abandon*, so art developed into fashion and architecture fell. There was the gothic and monastic spirit which raised buildings as memorials and evidence of a great and long-continued effort to christianise the world; and there was the Renaissance spirit, which sought to revert to the civilisation and morality of Paganism. Between the two, the degradation of architecture came, and the spirit of modern architecture—if it can be said to have one—is little better than a reflection of any and every other age, but never of its own. Could the tragedy of architecture be more complete?

In the congested and breakneck state of our present civilisation, what should be the legitimate influence of natural conditions on architecture is quite neglected. We are not disposed to "waste our time," for instance, over exactness in regulating the lines of perspective of our buildings, nor do we use curved lines instead of straight ones to counteract the visual distortion.

When one is practising in a city where land has reached untold value, it is quite evident that there will not be so many chances of utilising the site as there would have been but for this initial difficulty. History affords no parallel to the extraordinary value of land in the cities at the present day. The compression of multitudes into small areas has created problems almost bewildering in embarrassment. But there are many details in our national architecture which might be much more intelligently treated in spite of this, and if they were, the reproach on architecture which at present exists might be to a great extent removed.

Prior to the great Industrial Revolution which was the characterising feature of the Victorian Era, architecture had only problems presented by Nature to face; life was simple, and what artificiality existed was little and inconsequential. But with the introduction of machinery, mechanical contrivances entered intimately into everyday life, revolutionising all forms of building and bringing about untold complexity in architectural problems. Steam, electricity, and free education produced a society different to any that had

previously existed. The ends of the earth were united, and the most tremendous action and reaction came into play. Our lives have thus developed into one unending, breathless hurry, a senseless scamper of all classes of society.

The scarcity of land in the cities has developed "the skyscraper," and if this latest innovation is not so far advanced in Europe as in America, there is no doubt as to the tendency of expansion vertically in place of laterally. And it might be added, expansion downward, another and not impractical solution of the land difficulty.

Evolution—mechanical—has advanced the spirit of engineering at the expense of art. One by one, as the various processes of manufacture succumbed to the moloch of machinery, art left them, and expressionless productions have been the result. Again, the genius of invention, though supplying us with what we are pleased to call necessities of civilisation, has initiated difficulties which the architect must face and solve. To-day we have the gigantic powers of electricity, steam, heat and water harnessed to our wants, and with improved sanitation, fire protection, and a universal regard for law and order, absolutely new conditions have been created. Manufacturing processes are widespread, all kinds of artificial building materials are made and used, and iron and glass, which now enter so largely into construction, are in themselves almost new elements. Business methods have been reduced to a science as exact as any on the old college curriculum, and the ever-varying change, interchange and introduction of new trades, are fresh problems with which to grapple. Above all, the gigantic aggregations of capital, powerful and close combinations both of masters and men, the increased dependence of the people on the railways for transmission of both goods and passengers, are staggering questions which demand a correct answer if progress is to be achieved.

Buildings are so very different now from what they used to be. Houses, workshops, factories, railway stations, theatres, churches, hotels, clubs, &c., need the vigilant application of new ideas and the constant scheming of new methods. The work of an architect to-day embraces almost every trade and occupation under the sun; a moment's reflection is hardly necessary to see the immense field it occupies—a field in which architects *must* adapt themselves to modern conditions. Our future advancement is intimately interwoven with the influence architects exert on the national life.

There never was a time when a more intelligent architecture was needed as now, and there never was a time when it was more neglected. An intelligent architecture would not sacrifice utility to beauty, or prefer plainness to ornament. A building can have beauty and utility, art and engineering, and still be good architecture and a harmonious whole. The question is, what are the tests of good architecture? Where should the merely mechanical

requirements end and the artistic begin? Architecture cannot be judged like the work of a lawyer or physician; with them the number of briefs or patients spell success, but the number of buildings a man builds are no test, necessarily, of his qualification to erect good architecture. There are plenty of buildings built which are successful works of construction, skilful arrangement, &c., which have absolutely no merit whatever when viewed from the architectural and artistic point of view. Their designers undoubtedly possess talent of high order, and technical skill in clever arrangement, but attributes of artistic beauty they can *not* be said to possess. Utility and proper construction are the tests which the multitude consider are quite sufficient for buildings. Like any other art, architecture is only understood by the very few—those who possess either an inherent artistic tempêrment, or those who have been educated up to a high standard of taste. Popular admiration is not worth much, art is such an intangible quality and so little valued. There is no royal road to the acquirement of the artistic faculty. It often seems a pity that art could not be served out like a commodity, "Please, I've come for father's art." But like all other paths to knowledge it is a long and weary one, and only by patient and unremitting labour is the goal ever reached.

Intelligent architecture does not imply any compromise between the elements of beauty and utility, but it does imply a strict application of common sense in dealing with them. Is there any reason why architecture should be denied a common-sense treatment like which is given to any other branch of progress and thought? In cases without end we see architecture made the victim of downright absurdity. Why should windows be arranged just to suit a symmetrical façade without any thought for the poor rooms behind them? And why should not some attention be bestowed upon the question of the sunlight, that it be given to rooms where it is wanted, and not to minor offices? How often is the door neglected, small and cramped up, and without a porch which might be very properly made a feature of our national architecture, considering the varied nature of our climate. The value of land has spread a wild fear lest an inch should be wasted. This is quite right, but why try to squeeze *everything* in, and of the very smallest dimensions? What is the good of a "store-room" the size of a match box, or a "hall" about the area of a bird-cage? Let us get back to intelligence and think of what is the use of a house in which the pieces of furniture cannot often be got in? It is quite a common occurrence for expensive and really good furniture to be taken to pieces, pulled about and eventually ruined, whilst endeavouring to get it to a certain room. Nor are these structural difficulties the only ones that call for improvement, but in a great many cases the arrangements for heating, lighting, drainage, ventilation, &c., are designed—

being considered as adjuncts to the building—without any reference to their surroundings. Thus the most painful and ludicrous results are constantly to be seen. Morris told us that architecture was “the art of building suitably with suitable materials,” and that “nothing was more likely to lead to a really living style—a desideratum which everybody is seeking for—than the consideration first of all . . . of the suitable use of material.” Was he right or wrong? In his opinion stone was the most noble and satisfactory building material, wood coming next, and brick to be only considered as a makeshift. But what do we do—build in cheap brick or glaring terra-cotta, and roof in with Welsh slates. Oh, the criminality of it!

Consul Pliny in a letter written to his friend Gallus in the early part of the first century of our era, described his newly-finished villa of Laurentinium, and set forth the natural conditions which are essential for successful building better than they have ever been set forth. He said:

“You are surprised that I am so fond of my Laurentinium, or (if you like the appellation better) my Laurens. But you will cease to wonder when I acquaint you with the beauty of the villa, the advantages of its situation and the extensive prospect of the sea coast. It is but seventeen miles from Rome, so that, after finishing my affairs in town, I can pass my evenings here without breaking in upon the business of the day. There are two different routes to it. If you go by that of Laurentum, you must turn off at the fourteenth milestone; if by Ostia, at the eleventh. Both of them are in some parts sandy, which makes it somewhat heavy and tedious if you travel in a carriage of ease, and pleasant to those who travel on horseback. The landscape on all sides is extremely diversified, the prospect in some places being fine pine-woods, in others extending over large and beautiful meadows, where numberless flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, which the severity of the winter has driven from the mountains, fatten in the vernal warmth of its rich pasturage. My villa is large enough to afford all desirable accommodation without being extensive. The porch before it is plain, but not mean, through which you enter into a portico, in the form of the letter D, which includes a small but agreeable area. This affords a very commodious retreat in the bad weather, not only as it is enclosed with windows, but particularly as it is a shelter by an extra projection of the roof. From the middle of this portico you pass into an inward court, extremely pleasant, and thence into a handsome hall, which runs out towards the sea, so that when there is a south-west wind it is generally washed with the waves, which spend themselves at the foot of it. On every side of this hall there are either folding-doors or windows equally large, by which means you have a view from the front and the two sides as it were of three different seas; from the back part you see the middle court, the portico, and the area, and by any view you look through the portico into the porch, whence the prospect is terminated by the woods and mountains, which are seen at a distance. On the left hand of this hall, somewhat further from the east, lies a large drawing-room, and beyond that a second of larger size, which has one window to the rising and another to the setting sun; this has likewise a prospect to the east, but, being at a greater distance, is least needed by us. The angle at which the projection of the hall forms with this drawing-room retains and increases the warmth of the sun, and hither my family retreat in

winter to perform their exercises. It is sheltered from all winds except those which are generally attended with clouds, so that nothing can render this place useless but what at the same time destroys the fair weather.

"Contiguous to this is a room forming the segment of a circle, the windows of which are so placed as to receive the sun the whole day. In the walls are contrived a sort of case, which contains a collection of those authors whose works can never be read too often. Thence you pass into a bed-chamber, through a passage which, being boarded and suspended as it were over a stove which runs underneath, tempers the heating which it receives and conveys to all parts of this room. The remainder of this side of the house is appropriated to the use of my slaves and freedmen, but most of the apartments are neat enough to receive any of my friends.

"In the opposite wing is a room ornamented in very elegant taste, next to which lies another room, which, though large for a parlour, makes but a moderate dining-room. It is exceedingly well warmed, and enlightened not only by the direct rays of the sun, but by their reflection from the sea. Beyond is a bed-chamber, together with its ante-room, the height of which renders it cool in summer, as its being sheltered on all sides from the winds makes it warm in winter. To this apartment another of the same sort is joined by one common wall. Thence you enter into a grand and spacious cooling-room, belonging to the bath, from the opposite walls of which two round basins project sufficiently large to swim in.

"Contiguous to this is the perfuming-room, then the sweating-room, and next to that the furnace which conveys the heat to the baths. Adjoining are two other little bathing-rooms, fitted up in an elegant rather than a costly manner. Annexed to these is a warm bath of extraordinary workmanship, wherein one may swim and have a prospect of the sea at the same time.

"Not far hence stands the tennis court, which lies open to the warmth of the afternoon sun. Then you ascend a sort of turret, containing two entire apartments below, and there are the same number above, besides a dining-room which commands a very extensive prospect of the sea, together with the beautiful villas that stand interspersed upon the coast. At the other end is a second turret, in which is a room that receives the rising and the setting sun. Behind this is a large repository, which is a gallery of curiosities, and underneath a spacious dining-room, where the roaring of the sea, even in a storm, is heard but faintly. It looks upon the garden, and the *gestatio* which surrounds the garden. The *gestatio* is encompassed with a box-tree hedge, and, where that is decayed, with rosemary, for the box in those parts which are sheltered by the buildings preserves its verdure perfectly well, but where, by an open situation, it lies exposed to the spray of the sea, though at a great distance, it entirely withers. Between the garden and this *gestatio* lies a shady plantation of vines, the alley of which is so soft that you may walk bare-footed upon it without any injury. The garden is generally planted with fig and mulberry-trees, to which this soil is as favourable as it is averse to all others. In this place is a banquetting-room, which, though it stands remote from the sea, enjoys a prospect nothing inferior to that view. Two apartments run round the back part of it, the windows whereof look upon the entrance of the villa and into a very pleasant garden. Hence an enclosed portico extends, which, by its great length, you might suppose erected for the use of the public. It has a range of windows on each side, but on that which looks towards the sea there are double the number of those next the garden. When the weather is fair and serene those are all thrown open; but if it blows, those on the side the wind sits are shut, while the others remain unclosed without any inconvenience.

"Before this portico lies a terrace perfumed with violets, warmed by the reflection of the sun from the portico, which, as it retains the rays, so it keeps off the north-east wind, and thus, warm on this side as it is cool on the opposite, in the same manner it proves a defence against the south-west wind, and thus, in short, by means of its situation, overcomes the force of the winds from whatever point they blow. These are some of its winter advantages. They are still more considerable in summer, for at that season it throws a shade upon the terrace during the forenoon, as it defends the *gestatio* and that part of the garden which lies contiguous to it from the afternoon sun, and casts a greater or less shade as the day either increases or decreases; but the portico itself is even cool when the sun is most scorching, for its rays fall directly upon the roof. To its different benefits I must not forget to add that by setting open the windows the western breezes have a free draught, and by that means the enclosed area is prevented from stagnating. On the upper end of the terrace and portico stands a detached building in the garden which I call my favourite, and, indeed it is particularly so, having erected it myself. It contains a very warm winter room, one side of which looks upon the terrace; the other has a view of the sea, and both lie exposed to the sun. Through the folding doors you see the opposite chamber, and from the window is a prospect of the enclosed portico. On that side next the sea, and opposite to the middle wall, stands a little elegant recess, which, by means of a glass door and a curtain, is either laid into the adjoining room or separated from it. It contains a couch and two chairs. As you lie upon this couch, from the foot you have a prospect of the sea; if you look behind you see the neighbouring villas, and from the head you have a view of the woods: these three views may be seen very distinctly from so many different windows in the room, or blended together in one confused prospect. Adjoining this is a bed-chamber, which neither the voices of the servants, the murmuring of the sea, nor even the roaring of a tempest can reach; nor lightning, nor the day itself can penetrate, unless you open the windows. This profound tranquillity is occasioned by a passage which separates the wall of this chamber from that of the garden, and thus, by means of that intervening space, every noise is precluded. Annexed to this is a small store-room, which, by opening a little window, warms the bed-chamber to the heat required. Beyond this lies a chamber and ante-chamber which enjoy the sun, though obliquely indeed, from the time it rises till the afternoon. When I retire to this garden apartment I fancy myself a hundred miles from my own house, and take particular pleasure in it. At the feast of the Saturnalia, that, by the licence of that season of festivity, every other part of my villa resounds with the mirth of my domestics. I neither interrupt their diversions nor they my studies."

When it is recollected that this letter was written more than 1800 years ago, in a civilisation radically different to our own, with society, culture and knowledge developed in altogether another spirit, it will be seen what a remarkable account of correct building methods it is. The principles it illustrates are as much the true ones as they were then, and the lessons they teach are as important to us as they were interesting and instructive to the Roman citizen of so long ago. What matters it, that the description is of a building erected more than eighteen hundred years ago and that it has probably long since perished from the earth? The letter is an honest enunciation of truth, and though from its archæological interest it is of great importance, it is the more so, from its admir-

able description of a model Roman dwelling. Pliny—not an architect—never showed his common sense more strikingly and to better advantage than in the erection of his villa, and he showed he was a student of nature and a man of keen observation as well. To him, utility is the chief consideration which should be observed in architecture and coupled with it are the conditions imposed by environment. It is an economic matter. We should take advantage of the natural situation, direction of winds, heat of the sun, temperature and climate as well as the added element—æsthetic effect. Adaptation to use was the main feature of Pliny's design. There was no insistence of the beautiful or intrusion of the ugly. Everything was arranged as convenience demanded or sense suggested, as well as fancy pictured, and the consequence was that a house was created which satisfied the everyday wants of its owner as well as the higher ideals.

In contradistinction to the pleasure which Pliny derived from his villa, is the general dissatisfaction which is expressed to-day against all classes of modern buildings—whether costing much or little. And architects are largely to blame, for instead of being leaders of a progressive architectural movement they show themselves radically unable to give us anything worthy of our age and generation. J. Ernest Phythian in his *Story of Art in the British Isles* says :

“Probably the revolt can make but little headway for many years, yet in a country which cannot, or will not, produce its own food, and is forced or thinks itself forced, to push machine-made ‘goods’ produced first for sale, and then, if at all, for real use, on all the markets of the world. But it may be that we are on our way to a social, economical and political *reductio ad absurdum*, the proof of which may lead to changes, evolutionary, if not revolutionary, after which art may have its chance again.”

One wonders :

“Since earlier men have raised their race
So high above its former place,
Why may not we as well aspire
To lift our place and purpose higher?
To feel within the hungry breast
Some goading spur of grand unrest,
Some glorious aim, in impulse rife,
That urges on to fuller life.”—GRANT ALLEN.

GUY WILFRID HAYLER.

THE FACTORY ACTS CONSOLIDATION BILL.

SOME anxiety is, at the date of writing, being displayed as to the prospects of the above Bill becoming law this Session. It will, however, be generally conceded in the meantime that by the introduction of the Consolidation Bill a distinct forward step has been taken. The merits of the measure, as affording an ordered conspectus of the present state of factory legislation, are entitled to the full recognition of those even who feel most inclined to be critical otherwise. To the numerous class of people who, in one way or another, have to deal with the present statutes relating to the subject, the advantage of having in the Bill an exposition of the exact state of the statute law on any given point is obvious.

Looking first at the *form* of the Consolidation Bill, as distinguished from its substance, the more logical arrangement of its clauses, as compared with those of the Act of 1878, attracts immediate notice. As illustrating this, it may be useful at the outset to pass in review, shortly and generally, the various sub-divisions of the Bill, contrasting these with the Act. The Bill, it may be mentioned, is divided into ten parts as against four in the Act of 1878.

The First Part of the Bill contains now only three sub-divisions; it groups the provisions relating to health and safety, winding up with those concerning accidents, which formerly succeeded the sections relating to education. Part Second—Employment—now contains, as substantive enactments, the provisos of the first five schedules of the Act of 1878, the schedule form of legislation being kept up only in Schedules ii. and vii. of the Bill which relate respectively to factories and workshops in which overtime is allowed—corresponding to Part Three of the third schedule of the Act—and the list of non-textile factories and workshops, Schedule iv. of 1878. Part Three contains the sections relating to education, which, as before explained, follow, instead of, as formerly, preceding the employment provisions.

Part Four is newly framed, and deals with dangerous and unhealthy industries. To it are transferred, *inter alia*, the provisions of the first schedule of 1878 as to the non or restricted employment in certain factories and workshops of children, young persons, or girls

under sixteen. Part Five, also new, headed "Modifications and Extensions," consolidates the provisions of the Act of 1895 relating to tenement factories, and those of the Cotton Cloth Factories Acts of 1889 and 1897, and of the Acts of 1883 and 1895, relating to bakehouses, whitelead factories, and laundries. Part Six (new) groups the provisos as to home work, domestic factories and workshops, incorporating also the fifth schedule of 1878. In Part Seven, under the heading "Particulars of Work and Wages," provisions of the Act of 1895 are incorporated.

Parts Eight and Nine, as now sub-divided under the headings of "Administration" and "Legal Proceedings," take the place of Part Three of the 1878 Act, "Administration, Penalties, and Legal Proceedings." In its concluding sections, Part Eight groups the formerly scattered provisos as to special orders and notices, registers and returns. Part Ten, the concluding one, corresponding to Part Four of 1878, contains the definitions, application to Scotland and Ireland, and repeal.

Glancing now similarly at the Amendment Bill, which has just been incorporated with the consolidating measure, we find that the proposed substantive enactments consist almost entirely of amendments to the Acts of 1891 and 1895, and also of the 1883 and 1889 Acts. It will be remembered that an Amendment Bill was introduced last year also, and the present Bill has been generally recognised as simplified and improved as compared with that Bill.

As already indicated, a great step towards what is a desideratum in this department of legislation, *simplicity*, has been taken in the leading Bill, by the discarding, as far as possible, of the "long schedules of temporary or permanent modifications," suspending or supplanting the more general provisions of a number of the enactments of the 1878 Act. It follows also that the contradictions, inconsistencies, and anomalies involved in the former clumsy method of legislation are greatly modified in the Bill. The grouping in consecutive sections of the provisions relating to the employment of women, young persons and children, may be named as another great improvement in form, a remark which equally applies to those relating to orders and notices. It is a question, however, whether still further simplification might not be an advantage. A good example, perhaps, of the faulty and illogical grouping of the Act of 1878, which is reproduced in the Bill, clause 26, is that print works and bleaching and dying works, while non-textile factories under the Act for other purposes, are textile factories as regards hours of employment. They are thus in one class for a particular purpose, and in another for the rest. An illustration, too, of the sometimes purely arbitrary classification under non-textile factories in the seventh schedule of the Bill is that of fustian cutting works. The trade of fustian cutting, which is a process of raising a pile on

velveteens and velvets, by cutting the surface threads with a knife, is, we believe, almost wholly a process of manual labour, and for the most part a domestic occupation, or what may be styled a "cottage industry," like spinning in days gone by. The truth is, that the terms factory, workshop, and domestic workshop may now be regarded mostly as serving to remind us of the historical progress of factory legislation. It is no longer feasible to draw rigid distinctions between the various grades of industry. Quite obviously, at the present day there is no radical distinction of quality between a non-textile factory and a workshop, or between the latter and a domestic workshop.

Before passing on to consider in detail some of the leading provisions of the Bill, it may be indicated here how faithfully the draughtsman has done his work. This is shown by section 18 of the Consolidation Bill, replacing a corresponding section (22) of the 1891 Act. The clause reads: "Where a death has occurred by accident in a factory or workshop, the coroner shall forthwith advise the District Inspector of the time and place of holding the inquest." The passing of the Factory Act of 1895, 58 and 59 Vict. c. 37, it so happens, was simultaneous with that of the Fatal Accidents Inquiry (Scotland) Act 1895 (c. 36). Notwithstanding, in amending, by section 19 of the Act of 1895, the above clause in the Act of 1891, the latter might also have been amended in the direction of meeting Scottish requirements. As the clause stands now, though in a British statute, it has England only in view. In section 4 (2) of the Scotch Fatal Accidents Act just referred to, which introduced into Scotland a modification of the coroner's inquest, it will be seen that the corresponding Scotch equivalent to the coroner is the "sheriff clerk" as regards this matter. (Reference should also be made to sections 2 and 5 (5) of that Act, from which it will be seen that the corresponding judicial officer to the coroner is the sheriff.) Before the Bill passes, a subsection adapting the above clause to Scotland should be added to it, or the same result might be attained by including a reference to the Scotch Act in the section relating to definitions.

It is purposed now to deal with some of the sections of the Consolidation Bill, as far as possible in their order as they occur, and to offer some additional suggestions for amendment and legislation, as well as to indicate some of those which have from time to time been put forward.

The first clause of the Bill commences: "The following provisions shall apply to every factory as defined by this Act, except a domestic factory." In Part Six, relating to home work already spoken of, we observe the term "domestic factory" defined, and the opening clause of this part is found to deal with lists of outworkers, giving the effect of the existing legislation introduced

by the Acts of 1891 (section 27), and 1895 (section 42); while, on turning to the amending Bill, it is seen to be proposed to repeal these sections, and substitute improved regulations. Clause 109, again, lays down the regulations for the hours of employment of children and young persons in *domestic* factories and workshops. But—and this is important—the clause expressly states that the provisions of the Act as to the hours of employment of women shall not apply to *women* employed in these, and they are thus left unprotected. It may be mentioned also that the clause which Lord Thring and Lord Dunraven proposed to add as an amendment to the Act of 1891, forbidding women to perform certain specified work of the heavier kind in nail and chain making, has not up till now been passed into law.

The third clause of the Bill provides that a factory or workshop shall be deemed to be overcrowded if the proportion of air space to each person is less than 250 cubic feet. While the clause provides for special orders increasing this limit, it is probable that no medical authority would be ready to admit that the above allowance is adequate in the general case. By clauses 15 and 30 of the amending Bill, it is endeavoured to increase the effect of the sixth clause of the leading Bill providing for the maintenance of ventilation, without which the foregoing provision as to air space is of course nugatory.

Another important section is clause 60 of the Bill, which, following the 1891 Act, enacts: "A child under the age of eleven years must not be employed in a factory or workshop," while section 23 of the amending Bill is as follows: "A child under the age of *twelve* years shall not be employed in any factory or workshop unless so employed at the commencement of this Act." The latter age is that fixed by the Scottish Half-Timers Bill now before the House, and was that agreed to at the Berlin International Conference, at which Britain was represented. In France and Austria twelve is the age, while in Germany and Switzerland it is thirteen. As the law now stands, a child here between the age of eleven and thirteen is a "half-timer," and if on attaining that age he has obtained a certificate of proficiency or attendance, or, if not, on attaining the age of fourteen he is deemed a young person and may work full time. In 1890 it was urged by Mr. A. A. Baumann that the alternate day system for half-timers should be abolished, as being in desuetude. Clause 102, again, of the Bill states the maximum period of employment in laundries as, for children ten hours, young persons twelve hours, and women fourteen hours in the twenty-four. This maximum is thought to be too high for this arduous and not too healthy occupation. Clause 26 of the amending Bill proposes further legislative provisions on this topic, but does not seek to interfere with the non-applicability of the present law to domestic laundries.

Clause 122 provides for notice of occupation of a factory or workshop being given within one month; and as to this, it was also suggested by Mr. Baumann that the section should be amended so as to provide that the occupier shall during any *subsequent* period of occupation without notice be liable to a fine of not less than two or more than five pounds. It has sometimes been urged that the penalties inflicted by the Acts are not deterrent, and the remedy has been proposed that if notices of *second* convictions had to be exhibited on the walls of the factory for, say six months, this would get rid of these; and further, that notices might be put up in the factory that any complaints made to the inspector are treated as confidential.

Generally it may be said that proposals for amendment of the Factory and Workshops Acts in recent years have taken two directions. The first, that towards the extension of the scope of legislation has been partially successful, as has been seen in bringing the law down to domestic workshops, &c. The second is in the direction of a radical change in the system, including the wider question of a further restriction of hours in all trades. This latter problem must also be viewed as an international one, and some impetus may have been given to the working-class ideal of an international federation of labour by the holding of the Berlin Conference alluded to above.

Allied with the first-named proposals, again, is the question of the extension of legislation to cognate industries. The Agricultural Children and Gangs Acts, in the sixties, and the Shop Hours Acts, were steps (feeble ones, it is true) in the direction of subjecting agriculture to a similar control to manufacture, and of regulating the hours for the sale of commodities, as well as for their production. The trend of extension, in fact, was from commodities to services, and from production to exchange. The Commissioners of 1875, however, recommended that agriculture should be excluded, and it was classed by them among the wandering occupations, with "errand boys, match-sellers, and hawkers of goods, the boys employed by carriers, and bargemen on canals." They proposed, however, a special provision in favour of boys engaged in carrying from place to place goods in process of manufacture, but to exclude boys engaged in assisting bricklayers, carpenters, plumbers, painters, locksmiths, and so on, when working away from home. They recommended that persons engaged in working about a ship under repair should be considered as employed under the Factory Acts, while this was not to extend to the workmen above referred to working on a house under repair. Docks and wharves have, of course, since been brought under the Acts.

The criterion of inclusion has been propounded as being "employment in" production under another person, distribution being

regarded as included in production. In this view domestic service would be excluded, as being on the same footing as that of producers of immaterial products (*e.g.*, authors and clergymen), and barmaids, whose case might be regarded as depending on specialities, would also be excluded. It has been suggested, too, that the Acts might be extended to such "services" as hotel servants and the lodging-house drudge. It is a question of construction whether a cook making pastry in a hotel is not now under the protection of the Acts (see 41 Vict. c. 16, sec. 93, sch. IV., part 3). Other occupations suggested are those of railway and tram officials, gas men, postmen, clerks and salesmen, the latter's labour being in a sense as productive as that of the artificer or agriculturist.

Men's workshops are still, generally speaking, outside the scope of the Acts. The Acts, however, now regulate adult male labour *inter alia* in regard to the fencing of machinery and reporting of accidents and sanitation, and, indirectly, the hours of labour. The provisions as to labour in mines, alkali works, white lead works, bakehouses, cotton cloth factories, &c., embrace all persons employed. One effect, in fact, of the timid legislation of 1878 was an immediate recrudescence of the demand for more stringent legislation applicable to adult labour.

JOHN SHIRLEY.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY PROBLEM.

VIEWED FROM ANOTHER STANDPOINT.

It is in no spirit of controversy, still less with any feeling of bitterness, that I commit to paper a few ideas suggested to me by "Bigot's" article in the June number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

Every question has two sides, and it is only natural that the standpoint of a Catholic layman should be somewhat different from that of a Protestant (you will note I do not make use of the term "bigot"). This standpoint, the standpoint of a plain man, I will endeavour to set forth in a few plain words.

To begin with, I most emphatically deny the assertion that the agitation for a Catholic University proceeds almost entirely from the hierarchy. They, as our natural leaders, may head the charge; we follow, with prayers, good wishes, and all action in our power. A Catholic father who loves his children, and has what he believes to be their eternal interest at heart, needs no priest to remind him of his duty in this respect. The matter lies in a nutshell. Catholics consider loss of the Faith as the greatest calamity which may befall their children, and therefore *cannot* with equanimity send them into a wholly alien atmosphere at an age when they are comparatively easy to influence. I grant that there might be no direct interference; I have every confidence in the honour and tolerance of college authorities; but they cannot alter the atmosphere, and it is always atmosphere that tells. Long experience has taught me that mere personal influence is of small account beside it. It is a severe test for a youth of twenty to be thrown into a world which, after all, regards him more or less as a fool, or, at best, superstitious; and though it is a test which most Catholic youths must sooner or later undergo, a good parent would not willingly subject his son to it earlier than is needful. Take the case of a zealous Protestant father living in a Catholic country. Would he be content to send his boy to one of the great Catholic Universities? Or, if he did so, would it not be with some misgiving and words of timely warning? And if he finally decided to give him an inferior education, coupled

with (as he deemed) greater safety, I, for one, would shake hands with him and respect his feeling.

Constituted as it is at present, I do not see how Protestants can expect Catholics to send their sons to Trinity; especially as they openly declare that, were it as Catholic as it now is Protestant, they would certainly refuse to send Protestant youths there. Moreover, Ireland is a Catholic country, and she desires to have a Catholic University—an Irish Catholic University, with Irish Catholic traditions. Oh, you who have the power, imagine a Catholic University foisted on a Protestant country (Scotland, for instance!), and be generous—nay, just—to those who do not see eye to eye with you. Are you afraid of “division and isolation”? Unfairness, that is what rankles in the heart of a nation, as in the heart of an individual, destroying all possibility of mutual confidence and good understanding.

In conclusion, I would submit that the promoters of a Catholic University are not, on that account, the “enemies of Christian brotherhood.” They are only acting in accordance with their convictions, and it is worse than useless to give them bad names. It is like throwing stones—two can play at that game. And it is a sorry game at best, for are we not all children of one Father!

M. CAMILLUS STRATTON

WHAT IS CIVILISATION?

THIS is a highly important question, as is shown by the frequency of the excuse for conquest of other people and the seizure of their land, that it is carrying to them "the blessings of civilisation." How much confusion of thought exists as to what these blessings are is shown by the frequency with which poverty, disease, drunkenness, the keenness of the struggle for existence, and other miseries, are spoken of as "incident to a high state of civilisation," and this by people who profess to have something to say worth hearing upon social questions.

The real meaning of the word "civilisation" is apparent from its derivation. It is from "civis," a citizen. "Civilise" means to "citizenise," that is, to qualify a man for living as a member of a community. Civilisation is the art of social life.

Ideal civilisation would mean that the members of a community so behaved towards one another as to obtain the fullest advantage from their association.

Any country whose social system and the behaviour of whose citizens are obviously contrary to the rules which make for the greatest common advantage must be called uncivilised.

To decide what the rules of civilisation are, it is only necessary to consider what are the objects for which men associate.

First in obviousness, and perhaps in importance, is the mere pleasure of association, which alone would be sufficient to make every healthy man choose society rather than solitude. Closely allied to this advantage is that of obtaining a wider choice of wives and husbands, and thus making for the improvement of the race.

It follows that the first rule of civilisation is that social intercourse shall be as free as possible. A country where social intercourse is hampered by artificial division into classes and by difference of education, so that the members of different classes cannot associate together, work together, or live together, without discomfort or embarrassment, must be called uncivilised.

The next great object of association is the obtaining of mutual assistance in emergencies. All men are liable to accidents and diseases which may render them temporarily helpless and dependent for the time for their preservation on the assistance of others.

The emergency of infancy is experienced by all, and that of old age by all in whom it is not forestalled by some other accident.

It is evident that a number of individuals who do not assist one another run the risk of being destroyed in detail, like the ten little niggers, by a series of accidents which proper mutual assistance might have avoided. It is obvious, then, that such mutual assistance is so important to the preservation of a community, that a community which does not render to all its members proper assistance against emergencies is lacking in one of the most important elements of civilisation.

To illustrate this proposition: if a society of a dozen members, living together in a small space, were to allow a wounded and crippled companion to die in their sight for want of food and nursing, every one would agree in calling their neglect inhuman. Now inhumanity means that the person guilty of it is a traitor to the most essential obligations of humanity, so that he has forfeited his right to the name of human. Inhumanity, then, is the very opposite of civilisation.

But to take another illustration. Supposing that our small society has grown larger until it counts thousands or millions of members, and supposing that it now allows one of its members to perish for want of temporary assistance, not within sight of the other members, but because they have all managed to shut their eyes to his condition and have persuaded themselves that it is no business of theirs, or because they have not decided whose business it is to attend to him and each leaves it to the others, is not such society as a whole just as lacking in humanity as was the smaller one?

At any rate, whether the defect of the large society is in its heart or its head, whether it arises from deliberate repudiation of its duty towards its members or from want of a proper organisation for carrying out such duty, it is evident that in a society which can allow its own members to perish thus there is such a want of unity that it is far from a condition of civilisation.

So, if in any country citizens who are disabled by infancy, age, sickness, or accident, run any risk of starvation or serious discomfort through poverty, that country must be called uncivilised; for the full recognition of the duty to render its members full assistance in all emergencies would tend so much to its advantage, not only in avoidance of actual suffering and contemplation of suffering, but also in avoidance of constant anxiety through fear of poverty, that to forego such great advantage, whether through wilfulness or ignorance, would be to forfeit all claim to civilisation.

And if, in the case just supposed, the helpless citizen were left without assistance because each of his fellows feared that to render assistance would be to put himself at a disadvantage in a competitive

struggle for existence with others, that society would lie under a double stigma, from a civilised point of view, whose members, instead of assisting, are ready to turn even one another's virtues to their disadvantage.

The next of the great advantages of association lies in the effect of co-operation in work. It is well recognised that combined labour, properly organised, may be made immensely more effective than the same quantity of individual labour, and when it is remembered that it is in combination alone that machinery can be made and used to any great extent and the great aid of scientific inventions made available, it will be admitted that here is an advantage which civilisation must make the most of.

* An essential condition of civilisation, then, is a reasonably effective industrial organisation, in which the work of every member is utilised, each individual having his or her allotted task, in a definite scheme of combined effort.

It is evident that this condition is not fulfilled in a country in which a leisured class can exist, in which men can be sweated or women driven by fear of starvation to degradation, or where any person can have any difficulty in finding employment. A country in which it can be gravely stated that there is not work to be found for some of its members whilst any of them are in want of anything is pretty low down in the depths of barbarism.

But it must be remembered that combination in work is of no advantage unless the increased product thereby obtained is properly utilised. If a number of men combine their labour and so increase their productive power, but find that, after all, they are worse off than if they had remained apart, it is evident that there is something radically wrong in their organisation and that they have missed true civilisation.

If invoking the aid of machinery is found to cause distress amongst numbers of the members, if every increase of productive power still leaves a large number in poverty, and others in constant fear of poverty, the industrial system is wrong. If it is possible for men of authority as industrial experts to gravely opine that distress in the community exists in consequence of *over-production*, the condition of that country can best be described as chaos.

One of the ways in which the productive power of a community may be wasted is by its being wrongly directed. An obvious rule of common sense, which every individual when left to his own resources will observe as a matter of necessity, is to produce sufficient necessities before spending time and energy in the production of superfluities. If Robinson Crusoe, when shipwrecked, had set himself to make a fancy clock before he had provided for his food and shelter, he would have been regarded as insane. The same condemnation must be passed upon a community which produces

jewellery, carved sideboards, and pleasure yachts whilst it has not sufficient food to properly feed all its members, nor sufficient clothing, shelter, fresh air, and pure water to keep them in health. It would be bad enough if those who are underfed were left to console themselves as best they could with the jewellery, sideboards, and yachts, but when these articles of luxury are appropriated by those who have also more than their share of the necessities, the evil of misdirection is aggravated by the evil of unfair distribution.

Let it be granted for the purpose of this essay that it is an arguable question whether distribution should be absolutely equal, whether it should not rather be according to the need of the individual; of the self-sacrifice involved in his work; of the intrinsic value of his work, or of its market value (a sometimes very different thing). Civilisation requires that it shall at any rate be upon some rational system, and, if upon one of the two last mentioned, that each individual should have a fair opportunity to earn as good a living, and live as pleasant a life, as if alone in an ordinarily productive country, since it is not to be supposed that he would have consented to be a member of the community upon any less favourable terms. A country must be far removed from civilisation of which its most famous political economist could write that its payments to members seemed to be almost in inverse ratio to the arduous nature of their work.

It may be argued that unevenness of distribution is not a disadvantage to the community as a whole, since the privation of those who go short is balanced by the gain of those who obtain the excess, but a moment's reflection will show that this is a fallacy. If A. and B. are each receiving £100 per annum, and you take £50 from A. and give it to B., it is evident that A. will suffer more in the deprivation of ordinary conveniences of life than B. will gain in benefit by the increase in his income. If the remaining £50 be taken from A. to increase B.'s income to £200, the loss to A. will still more overbalance the gain to B.

It would be necessary, or at least highly advantageous, to the attainment of such civilisation as above described, that all the members of the community should have a due sense of their duties towards one another, each one as scrupulous to allow to others their fair share of all benefits as anxious to obtain his own. Therefore we should find in a civilised community that men would be esteemed mostly for their consideration for others, and that a citizen who would indulge in luxury while others wanted necessities, or would appropriate to himself more land or any other property than each one could possess, would be regarded with similar condemnation (but more severe, as involving matters of more importance) as a guest at a social gathering who should lounge on three chairs at once whilst

others had to stand, or should cram his pockets with the refreshments intended for all whilst others had to go supperless.

In short, whilst poverty, when involuntary, would be regarded as a matter to be immediately remedied, and, when voluntary, a claim to respect, wealth would be regarded as a crime.

There is nothing novel in the above propositions. They have been recognised more or less completely by nearly every community that accident or design ever founded and by every brotherhood that has ever materially assisted in the progress of humanity. The Viking leader took an equal share of plunder with his followers, the early Christians and Mediæval monks had all things in common, the heroes of chivalry were men who took little for themselves whilst they worked hard for others, the pioneers who first settle on a gold-field divide the claims with rigid equality, and the survivors of a shipwreck, whilst waiting for salvation, share equally what they may find of provisions as of hardships.

Finally, the laws of good breeding, those that govern any social gathering, are precisely those which, if carried into all the operations of a community, would make it truly civilised.

Neither is there anything impossible nor even untested in these rules, as already shown. An interesting and now existing instance of the many small communities that have attained happiness by observing them is the Colony of Ruskin, Tennessee, described in volume iii. of *The Wide World*, p. 261 (1899). If it be said that no nation has held to them long, it may be replied that their abandonment has always been followed by poverty, disease, and the curse of mutual distrust. It is sometimes said that though small communities have tried them no large one ever has. It is true that it is a more difficult problem for a large community than a small one to govern itself; and for this reason conquest, that is, the increase of the size of a community by force, is deterrent to civilisation.

But one large community, at any rate, the ancient Empire of Peru, attained so much more civilisation than any modern nation that all its citizens were well provided for, all entirely free from those great curses, poverty and the fear of poverty.

Perhaps the most truly civilised people of whom history gives us any record were the "naked savages" inhabiting Hayti when first discovered by Columbus. These people seem to have attained a state of happiness which filled the more thoughtful of their conquerors with envy, and this simply by applying to their social life the rules of common sense.

Impatient of unnecessary labour, their food and shelter were of the most easily procurable, and clothing was dispensed with. But of everything necessary to a comfortable existence there was ample provision for all, for what little work they did was properly directed. One result of this combined simplicity and abundance was that their

hospitality was ideally perfect. Any one who was in need of anything might help himself freely from the nearest house, and they gave freely to the Spaniards whatever they asked for without thought of barter. And why not? When one can always have plenty one can afford to be hospitable.

There is no fear of theft nor possibility of theft where he who needs is welcome to take, so these people's houses and gardens were not defended by bolts, dykes, or hedges.

And though scorning what we call the "Industrial Arts," that is, making useless things for the sake of making, their lives were not lacking in refinement; for the social arts—music, dancing, poetry, and conversation—were highly cultivated by them. And as for luxuries, they had in plenty and perfection those luxuries compared with which jewellery, paintings, and fancy clocks are rubbish, namely, ample leisure, fresh air, scenery, and unrestricted genial social intercourse.

C. M. BEAUMONT.

A CASE FOR INQUIRY IN THE POST OFFICE.

THE traveller in Rome is met with the following aphoristic comment on the absence of marble in the Coliseum: "What the Barbarians left the Barberinis took." It may be some distant echo of this aphorism which has led to the current saying in the Post Office on the causes of mortality among the employees. The generalised experience is summed up in the following grim sentence: "What consumption leaves the madhouse takes." This is perhaps not literally true, but it is a clear popular expression of the prevailing impression among the employees of the lower grades of the indoor postal service. Among the large bodies of sorters and telegraphists there is an ineradicable belief that consumption claims an abnormal tribute of lives, and among the telegraphists there is an equally deeply rooted belief that their work is productive of mental disease in all its forms, from the more severe and pronounced types which find treatment in an asylum, to those less serious cases which result in an amiable softness or express themselves in abnormal craving for alcohol. Nor are these beliefs confined to English postal employees alone. They are equally prevalent in the continental countries. At the International Congress of Telegraphists held in Como in June 1890 this became especially obvious. Delegates from Italy, France, England, Switzerland, and Austria made frequent references to the widespread belief, and their references were of such a character as to point to an underlying assumption of this as an incontrovertible fact.

Up to the present the science of statistics has furnished no complete data by which these beliefs can be accurately tested. But it nevertheless remains a most remarkable fact that such a universal belief should exist, and it would be still more remarkable should it turn out to be unwarranted. The electrical condition of the atmosphere is known to affect abnormally nervous persons, hysterical subjects and the like, producing changes which result in depression or excitement. But no detailed investigation exists upon the influence of an electrically charged atmosphere upon normal persons. Dr. Damian, a French scientist, and Dr. Charles Féré, a physician of the Bicêtre Hospital, have both separately studied the subject of

the influence of the electrical condition of the surrounding air upon their subjects, and there is every reason to believe that very profound nervous effects result from changes in electrical tension. Dr. Arlidge, who died recently, collected together a considerable mass of information and published it in a treatise on the *Diseases of Occupations*. His book became a classic, and undoubtedly led to the reduction of the mortality of most dangerous trades. In a letter dated April 9, 1896, he tells me: "I had hoped to get some returns of the longevity, the health and prevalent maladies especially of those constantly engaged in connection with electrical agencies and instruments. . . . I wrote to the officers of the Central Office, and was curtly told that it was contrary to the rule of the department to give information respecting the employees. Why it should be so I have never comprehended."

Far be it from me to assert that the electrically charged atmosphere is the chief or only cause of the insanity of telegraphists. I believe it to rest rather in other conditions of his work, chief of which is its monotony. I was discussing this question one day with a celebrated French electrician, and he said to me, "Imagine a man repeatedly writing or sending such phrases as 'Expect me at six thirty,' 'Shall be late to-night,' hundreds of times per day for years on end! Is it not enough to drive any man mad?" This is a very fair description of the mass of the telegraphists' work, and I am inclined to agree with the French expert.

Despite the refusal of official evidence on so important a subject it is still possible to get some figures, and these point wholly to the justification of the belief of the employees. If better statistics prove the contrary, which I doubt, it is obviously the duty of the postal authorities to produce them, and thus kill this bogey of the telegraph operator. An endeavour was made to kill the consumption bogey, which failed, and it remains incontrovertibly established that both in England and France hundreds of the postal employees die of preventible pulmonary disease.¹

Let us look at the justificatory evidence for this widespread belief of the telegraphists. In 1885 and 1886 particulars were given in the Post Office Estimates of the causes of retirement among telegraphists. They showed in 1885 that of a total of 32 pensions granted 20, or 62·5 per cent., were on account of nervous disease. The following year the same heavy percentage was shown. There were, in 1886, 34 cases of pensions, of which 18, or 52·9 per cent., were for nervous complaints. The remainder were mainly respiratory complaints. These figures immediately attracted the attention of the medical papers in England and America, the *Lancet* being especially strong in its comments. The postal department shielded

¹ Vide my paper, "Consumption in the Post Office," read before the British Congress on Tuberculosis on July 24 last.

itself by discontinuing the publication of the details! But no inquiry was made, such as M. Millerand has recently instituted concerning consumption and its ravages among the French postal employees.

The postal service has an insurance association known by an official misnomer as the United Kingdom Postal and Telegraph Service Benevolent Association. It is in every respect an insurance association, and as *all* postal lives are carefully selected lives, in consequence of the medical entry examinations, all members of this society are selected lives. Pick up its reports haphazard and we immediately see the justification for the belief that consumption and the madhouse take all the lives. I pick up the Report for 1895. Forty-seven telegraph deaths are recorded, of which nine are from nervous disease and thirty-two from pulmonary disease. The last Report for 1900 shows a total of thirty-seven telegraph deaths, of which two are suicides, six from nervous disease, and nineteen from respiratory disease.

Such a condition is indicated each year by the Reports of the society. The official figures, published in the Postmaster-General's Report for the last few years, confirm the unofficial figures for consumption. It certainly behoves the postal department to publish well classified and detailed statistics on the nervous and other complaints of telegraphists.

CHARLES H. GARLAND.

THE CLERGY AND THE TEACHING OF ETHICS.

IN the August number of the *Nineteenth Century* is a remarkable article by the Bishop of Hereford. It is entitled "Moral Influence in Politics," and seeks to account for the vast gulf which the Bishop discovers between the standard of morals which guides the action of individuals, and that which directs the actions of communities and states. The cause of the moral improvement of individuals he traces principally, if not exclusively, to the influence of Christianity. How, then, he asks, is it that there is so much immorality in our internal, as well as external public life?

It is due primarily, we are told, to the fact that Christ's teaching was intended purely for the individual, and the famous dictum, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's," is regarded as having the result of restraining the Churches from trying to directly influence the course of public and political life. And so, after the lapse of nineteen centuries of Christianity, Dr. Percival regards with pain and dismay the spectacle of a nation like England, whose public policy is too often dictated by selfishness, brutality, and the meanest and most ignoble motives.

To remedy this deplorable condition of things the Anglican prelate makes the proposal that manuals of practical ethics should be introduced into the schools, and that systematic instruction should be given with the object of directly elevating the character of the young.

Finally—and it is a most significant conclusion—"we need," he says, "a great deal more of the influence of ethical societies," and he proposes that these societies should become less academical in their nature and proceedings, and become more and more intimately associated with our every-day life.

Few thoughtful people will be disposed to deny the essential truth of Dr. Percival's criticisms of the public morality of the so-called Christian nations, especially as exhibited in the outside world in their relations with one another. It is a state of things which is more and more arresting the attention of serious politicians and

reformers, and party politics are becoming every day more and more influenced by this growing feeling of uneasiness due to an innate conviction that the continuous existence of such an evil condition is intolerable and fraught with the utmost peril to the interests of the community and of the world at large. It is the general conscience which is becoming, slowly, it is true, but still surely, more and more alive to the incongruities and inharmonies which are to be found between our professions as Christian peoples and our actual conduct.

So far we can cordially agree with the Bishop, but we cannot understand how, if Christianity had really had the influence upon individuals claimed for it by its apologists, it comes about that the corporate life, made up as it is of individuals, should be so tainted and corrupt in its external manifestations. Is the Bishop sure that the standard of morality set up by the individual for his observance is so much superior to that which inspires the action of all collectively as a nation? There must be some relation between the two; and it seems reasonable to suppose that if the general policy of a nation is corrupt it is due to a low standard of private and individual morality.

Let us take a case in point. The Bishop quotes the conduct of a certain South African statesman, who has earned for himself an unpleasant notoriety through his connection with an infamous conspiracy to overthrow the government of an adjoining state during a time of peace. This man was guilty of treachery and deceit, but owing to his social and political influence, due to the possession of great wealth and a forcible personality, he was able to disentangle himself from the miserable affair with an unblemished reputation in the eyes of the generality of his fellow-countrymen.

Do we not see every day the same phenomenon in private life? So long as a man has wealth and a commanding personality he can generally blind and pervert the moral sensibilities of his neighbours and townsfolk, however discreditable the transactions he is engaged in. The millionaires, who in America and other countries have built up their fortunes at the cost of the unremitting toil, and too often of the blood and tears, of thousands, are admired and worshipped by their fellow-countrymen; they are regarded as national institutions, and the stranger is invited to share in the general admiration of a social and political system, in which the existence of such fine flowers of our modern civilisation is rendered possible.

Beings of such an exalted station and with such ample resources at their command find little difficulty in satisfying every whim or desire without, as a rule, bringing themselves into open conflict with the law, which bears heavily only on those who often are driven by

helplessness and despair to acts of violence and crime, which they have not the means to disguise, and from the effects of which they are consequently unable to escape.

It seems, in fact, impossible to avoid the conclusion that if the policy of our statesmen is often misguided, arbitrary, and immoral, it is because such men, as individuals, have received a very imperfect ethical training, and are therefore just as likely to go wrong in private as in public life; only in the former case their errors are not attended by national disasters, and so do not attract general attention.

It must be the personal character of the statesman or public official which determines his policy; and the Bishop of Hereford himself admits this when he proposes to introduce text-books and practical lessons of morality into our schools as a means of improving the general moral atmosphere of the people and of elevating the aims of its rulers.

Christianity, he admits, after all these years, seems to have had little appreciable influence upon the secular policies of nations; but at the same time he would like us to believe that it has had a marvellously improving effect upon the personal character of individuals. Herein he exaggerates the value of the personal benefits to be derived from Christianity, and fails to see the exact ratio existing between the conditions of public and private morality.

Of course we all admit that there has been a great improvement in the standard of ethics adopted by the average individual during the last nineteen hundred years, and it follows that there has been also a corresponding improvement in national ethics, and Christianity may justly claim a certain share in this work of ethical evolution. How great that share is is a matter about which people will hold different views according to the nature of their religious beliefs. But it goes without saying that the unprejudiced historian and philosopher will not be disposed to credit Christianity with so important a part in this work as is claimed by its partisan followers.

The Church teaching of the past has laid its chief stress on the importance of dogmas and beliefs; the subject of ethics, as covering the field of actual conduct, has never at any time in Church history since the death of Christ been regarded as a matter of paramount importance, and consequently it has always been put into the background, and often entirely ignored in the curricula of instruction drawn up for the benefit of the young men who are ultimately intended to be the official exponents of their religion.

Nevertheless, there have been at all times men, even among the ranks of the Christian clergy, who have recognised that the spirit of

Christ's teaching was essentially ethical in character, and that its supreme value lay in the importance attributed to conduct, as distinguished from a mere profession of faith; and such men, by their own examples, as well as by the insistency with which they proclaimed those great, and fundamental principles upon which Christianity, like most other religious systems, is based, appealed to the innate moral instincts of their hearers and of all who came within the radius of their influence, and so have helped to raise the ethical standards of the community.

But such Christian teachers have unfortunately been in the minority. Had they been more numerous, and had they met with less opposition from their clerical brethren, who have ever denounced as unorthodox this purely humanitarian view of Christ's mission upon earth, we should not now be sorrowing with the Bishop over the national crimes of England or of any other "Christian" country, over crimes for which we, as individual units of the corporate whole, must be held responsible.

The remedy which Bishop Percival proposes for the gradual removal of the evils over which he laments so much, and with such good cause, is in every way a very remarkable one. The work of national regeneration he throws entirely on societies which have been in existence in England for only ten or twelve years, and which numbered at the beginning of the present year only about two or three thousand supporters throughout the length and breadth of the British Islands! It would be interesting to know where the Bishop would suggest that the money should come from for that extension of the work of these societies which the worthy man so warmly advocates. Will the Church of England subscribe? Surely as an institution endowed and supported by the State it might reasonably be supposed to take some interest in the condition of the morality of the nation and of its political representatives, its rulers and statesmen. If it does not regard this work as lying within its province, we may well ask—and our question will be echoed by the common-sense of a whole nation—"What rational grounds at all can it show for its continued existence as a State institution?" Not for one moment does the Bishop stop to consider whether the fault of the laxity of public morality of which he complains is in measure due to the practical refusal of the clergy of the Church, of which he is a dignitary and shining light, to undertake the moral and truly spiritual enlightenment of the people.

The silence of the Bishop on this point strikes one at first as being simply astounding; a little reflection, however, will show that he had a very good reason for ignoring the clergy as a possible and useful agent in this work of ethical propaganda. The general feeling of the leaders and teachers of the Church of England and of

most other Christian sects is one of intense antipathy to the ethical movement, as being one which strikes at the very root and foundation of their authority. Full expression is given to this sentiment in the number, dated August 30, 1900, of a well known religious weekly called the *Christian*, in which the writer, who is discussing this very question of the possibility of uniting the forces and energies of the Christian Churches and the Ethical Societies, says: "But to every such proposition true Christians can make but one reply. The gospel is a stewardship committed to men and women who have experienced its saving power; and above all else stewardship demands fidelity. Further, Christianity is a religion of facts, and the truth of its gospel is demonstrated by its effects upon the lives that receive it. The ethical teachers merely spin theories and propound philosophies; and these cannot regenerate men. So far from there being any rapprochement between the two things, we must see to it that the abyss widens every day."

It is obvious then that all proposals to the clergy to help in the great and good work of the teaching and preaching of ethical principles as the basis of right conduct in the life of the individual personal unit and of the corporate state will not find favour with that very considerable number of them who share the views and prejudices of the writer just quoted. In fact, any such suggestion acts upon the minds of such people as a red rag upon the proverbial bull, and arouses such feelings of irritation as are expressed in the very unethical and unchristian sentiment which we find at the conclusion of the passage above referred to. The Bishop was no doubt aware of all this, and was prudent enough to avoid making a proposal which would certainly excite the indignation of a large number of his clerical brethren, and would involve him in undignified squabbles and controversies, such as the past history of the Church has made us only too familiar with.

The ordinary layman, however, may be excused if he occasionally feels constrained to express his regret that the clergy as a whole make so little use of the golden opportunities afforded them in the pulpit, and through the vast influence which they still exert in the field of education, to assist in every possible way in this glorious work of ethical regeneration which the Bishop of Hereford justly considers to be so necessary for the true progress of any nation.

Unfortunately, the minds of the majority of them are at present occupied with very different tasks. They are too much possessed with the idea of the importance of preaching crusades for the conversion of Mohammedans, Buddhists, and Confucians, or too much impressed with the conception of the civilising and ennobling influences of war, or are too much wrapt up in the saving efficacy of chalices, vestments, pictures, and all the antique mumbo-jumbo

of priestly superstition, to be able even to see the real needs of the people, much less to remedy them.

“Blind moths! that scarce themselves know how to hold
A sheep-hook, or have learn'd aught else the least
That to the faithful herdsman's art belongs!
What reck's it them? What need they? They are sped;
And when they list, their lean and flashy songs
Grate on their scrannel pipes of wretched straw;
The hungry sheep look up and are not fed.”

MAURICE G. HERING.

THE NEW SNOBBISHNESS.

IN the WESTMINSTER REVIEW Lady Grove writes on the subjects of Mispronunciation and Middle-classdom. Certain tests, she says, may be adopted by which the sheep may be separated from the goats, the upper from the middle classes. The shibboleth of caste is to be found in the word "girl." The man or woman who pronounces the word "girl" is "outside the pale": presumably "gal" belongs to Whitechapel. She confesses, however, that she has known those who are unable to detect the difference: and we are driven to the conclusion that social salvation depends upon the ear more than on anything else. But though this test is conclusive, there are others which afford an equally valuable criterion. The socially saved must pronounce "valet" and "Calais" as though they were innocent of a Gallic origin; on the other hand, they must talk of "an 'otel," not "a hotel." The latter form makes a book unreadable. Again, one must speak of "port wine," not of "port"; this on the authority of those from whose "verdict there can be no appeal." The word "dress," when "gown" is meant, is forbidden, but a "napkin" should never be called a "serviette." The man who "leaves town" to join "a week-end party" is guilty of a double outrage; "photos," "bikes," and "wires" (when telegrams are meant) constitute an abomination. The man who finds himself alone in a hansom cab must on no account sit in the middle, or say that he has been "riding" in a hansom. Napkin-rings, fish-knives, tea-cosies, tidies, and nightgown cases are the insignia of the middle classes. Such is the alchemy of society.

But perhaps all would not be agreed, and the writer may be permitted to offer a few criticisms.

1. The writer has circularised the dukes and duchesses on the question of the pronunciation of "hotel." So great an expert as Lady Grove should be aware of the danger of trusting to ladies who are lower in the social scale. And she herself furnishes us with the dreadful consequences that follow from the imprudence of putting one's trust in "marchionesses." Now, sixty per cent. of the dukes and duchesses pronounce for "hotel," while thirty-nine per cent. are in favour of "'otel." The most astonishing answer received was to the effect that "it really did not matter." However, the writer was

only a dowager-duchess, and, I am afraid, a poor deluded creature at best.

2. Lady Grove says that she has seen "a countess of irreproachable breeding eating cheese with her knife."

In all the writer's experience he has never seen any one eat his cheese with anything else, but for one exception. He once saw a duke help himself with a tablespoon, and tear the cheese to pieces with his fingers. But he always thought it a very disgusting habit.

3. Lady Grove once saw "a marchioness drinking tea out of a saucer."

The writer can only exclaim "Shame!" He can truthfully say that in all his experience he has never known a duchess do such a thing. He could quote the melancholy fate of the Duchess of Q——, who died of diphtheria produced by pouring scalding tea down her throat.

4. One must speak of a "shift," not a "chemise."

The writer hesitates to speak of either. But his zeal for inquiry led him to ask for a "shift" at the shop of a milliner who, to his knowledge, provides underclothing to four princesses—a German highness and three duchesses. The milliner declared that he did not know what was meant.

5. "Gentlemanlike," not "gentlemanly."

It is to be hoped that no one who has the slightest reverence for the English language will use either of these words. The former implies that a man is like a gentleman but is not one, and before Lady Grove uses the word "genteel" again, may the writer beseech her to read the *Case of General Ople* (George Meredith). And, speaking of literature, there are one or two volumes which may be recommended—*Les Precieuses Ridicules*, *Les femmes savantes*, and the records of the Hotel Rambouillet.

6. "You must not sit in the middle of a hansom cab."

The last person the writer saw indulging in this vulgarity was an ex-Premier of England.

7. "Dimond," "aint," "wantin'," and "Seymer" are permissible and even aristocratic.

The best criticism is to be found in Lady Grove's article: "A fine ear, a delicate enunciation, and a refined spirit is necessary to the proper appreciation of the beauties of so subtle a language." Echo answers "Aint it just?"

It is to be hoped that we do not appear hypercritical. But of Lady Grove's test, we should say that the majority are tests, not of aristocracy, but of an ordinary knowledge of English. Others are entirely debateable: and the remainder are simply absurd. The fact is that we all know (though we may have different ideas on the subject) what is a gentleman and what is the reverse. He is not the sum total of a number of particularities of diction and costume.

In short, he is, he does not consist. He is an abstract entity, not a collection of capricious atoms. Ladies are unable to grasp abstract ideas of any kind. On the other hand, they have an infinite genius for minutiae and the microscope. They apply the only tests they are able to employ. Let them cling to their kingdom of Lilliput. It is to be regretted that they can see only the parts, but are unable to recognise the whole. But by all means let the parts be correct. Let no man be dubbed aristocratic because he says "aint" or "dimond," or plebeian because he pronounces "Calais" as if it was French, and "Cayenne" as if it was English. And, above all, may men be gifted with the power of distinguishing between "gentlemen" and "cads," while "the upper ten thousand," the "upper circles," or the "aristocracy" are relegated to their proper sphere in the kitchen.

OGIER RYSDEN.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

WE recently had the pleasure of calling attention to Dr. Hastie's translation of *Urbild der Menschheit* (The Ideal of Humanity) by Karl Chr. Fr. Krause, which we understand was the first attempt to introduce the writings of this philosopher to English readers. Those who have been interested in Dr. Hastie's book will, perhaps, be glad to know that a collection of Krause's miscellaneous writings, in one volume, is procurable from Messrs. Williams and Norgate, under the title of *Der Menschheitbund*.¹ Krause was a prolific writer, as the bibliography included in the present volume shows; and though in no little measure indebted to Schelling, he displays a striking originality. The book will repay perusal, though the awkward language occasionally employed may increase the difficulties of the English reader. It should interest the followers of Auguste Comte, although Krause recognises another god than the "Menschheit." *Der Menschheitbund* is an ideal not to be coldly set aside, but, like other ideals, worth striving after, even if it can never be wholly attained. If all nations could be gathered into one Federation, as Krause dreamed, international jealousies and wars would cease, and the millennium might then not be far off. We have in the book the author's thoughts on many interesting questions, telling us what our conduct in his ideal *Bund* should be; and on the whole he manifests a very broad and tolerant spirit. Especially interesting is the author's Creed or *Menschheitspruch* in imitation of that of Athanasius, as also his modification of the Lord's Prayer. It seems like the irony of fate that a man with such a large heart, ready to embrace all the world—the Founder, as he calls himself, of the *Menschheitbund*—should for so many years have led such an unhappy existence.

We have more than once welcomed contributions to philosophy issued by the enterprising firm of Fr. Fromman, and we have pleasure in calling attention to a recent publication, *Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam*, by T. J. de Boer.² The course of Moslem

¹ *Der Menschheitbund. Nebst Anhang und Nachträgen aus dem handschriftlichen Nachlasse von Karl Chr. Fr. Krause. Edited by Richard Vetter. London: Williams & Norgate.*

² *Geschichte der Philosophie im Islam. T. J. de Boer. Stuttgart: Fr. Fromman.*

philosophy, as the writer remarks, is more a process of digestion than production, no important progressive thoughts being discovered therein; but it is of value in so far as it was the first attempt to assimilate the results of Greek thought more largely, and with greater freedom than had been done in the *Altchristlichen Dogmatik*. The volume, like the first above noticed, is well printed in Roman type.

The second volume of the *History of the English Church*¹ (to be completed in seven volumes), of which the Very Rev. the Dean of Winchester and the Rev. W. Hunt are the general editors, is written by the Dean (W. R. W. Stephens) himself, and deals with the period from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I. This period is the most important in the "making of England"; in it the foundations of our institutions in Church and State were laid; it was an age of birth and growth, of vigour and progress—intellectual, religious and political. Mr. Stephens fully enters into the spirit of the time, and fitly tells the story of its stirring events. Great men like Lanfranc, Anselm, Becket, Stephen Langton, and Robert Grosseteste are vividly depicted, and their deeds related with appropriate and picturesque energy. Church and State grew together, and the qualities of churchmen and statesmen were generally combined. Religion and politics were not always the same thing, but they were almost inseparable; so the story of the Church is the story of England during this period. The author, however, does not confine himself to the political aspect of Church history, but describes the life and character of the clergy, the monastic orders, popular religion and learning, and other matters relating to the nation at large. The story of the period has never been better told, or perhaps so well in so small a compass. Summaries of principal events, &c., useful for reference, are given in Appendices.

Mr. Benjamin Walker is a bold man, or he would not have ventured to entitle his common-sense philosophy *Mr. Epictetus, Junr.*,² thus provoking unavoidable comparisons with the great Stoic. We admit Mr. Walker's common-sense, but regret his lack of style, for his little book is essentially disjointed and scrappy. We sympathise to a great extent with his dissatisfaction with formal philosophy and conventional religion, and agree that Stoicism properly understood offers a better refuge for the human mind. Mr. Walker's philosophy is not pure stoicism, as it is modified by Christian Theism, and the combination is productive of a cheerful optimism. The author says many sensible things, but few if any that are original. The book ought to be popular, and we wish it success.

¹ *The English Church from the Norman Conquest to the Accession of Edward I.* (1066-1272). By the Very Rev. W. R. W. Stephens, B.D., F.S.A. London and New York: Macmillan. 1901.

² *Mr. Epictetus, Junr., His Book.* Wherein is set forth a Common-sense Philosophy for the Conduct of Life. By Benjamin Walker. London and Manchester: John Heywood. 1901.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

A Century of Law Reform,¹ as its sub-title informs us, consists of Twelve Lectures on the Changes in the Law of England during the Nineteenth Century. These lectures were delivered at the request of the Council of Legal Education, in the Old Hall of Lincoln's Inn; and the Council is to be highly commended, not only for its conception of the idea, but also for its choice of instruments for carrying into effect an idea so calculated to stimulate interest in the theory and practice of law. The lecturers are all men standing in the front rank, either as practitioners in the courts, like Mr. Montague Lush, or as a jurist, like Dr. T. A. Castor, or as men combining both characters, like Dr. Blake Odgers, K.C., and Mr. Augustine Birrell, K.C. What better exponent of changes in the criminal law could one ask for than Sir Harry B. Poland, K.C., Treasurer of the Inner Temple? Dr. Blake Odgers is responsible for three lectures, Dr. Castor and Mr. Birrell for one apiece only. Both the latter are humorists of a high order, and both have keen political insight, examining and weighing the law not only from a legal standpoint, but from a social and political one as well. Much of the matter is necessarily elementary, but in these reactionary days of smug complacency it is just as well that the average man should be reminded of the vast changes which have taken place during the last century, changes carried out by men of progressive thought in the teeth of exactly the same opposition that is offered to-day by the conservative mind to every proposed alteration for the amelioration of society and the removal of injustice.

Our Public Schools: Their Influence on English History,² by Mr. J. G. Cotton Minchin, will appeal to every public-school man whether he belongs to those schools which are treated of here or not. The schools forming the subject of this volume are Charterhouse, Eton, Harrow, Merchant Taylors', Rugby, St. Paul's, Westminster, and Winchester. Shrewsbury the author has purposely omitted, as its history was being written by the late Mr. G. W. Fisher at the time he was engaged upon the present. If we may venture to make a suggestion, Mr. Minchin might include this famous school, together with many others, such as Tonbridge, Manchester, Uppingham, Repton, Hailebury, Epsom, and Leamington in a second volume, which, although perhaps lacking in such a wealth of historical inci-

¹ *A Century of Law Reform*. Twelve Lectures on the Changes in the Law of England during the Nineteenth Century. Delivered at the request of the Council of Legal Education, in the Old Hall, Lincoln's Inn, during Michaelmas Term, 1900, and Hilary Term, 1901. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1901.

² *Our Public Schools: Their Influence on English History*. By J. G. Cotton Minchin. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1901.

dents, would appeal very strongly to a very numerous class. Many of these schools have their own special annals, which cater only for their respective *alumni*, but intimately connected as most of them are with the leading events of our national history, each is of interest to the average Englishman, who naturally wishes to know something of these great national institutions, where our national characteristics are formed and trained. The present work should satisfy the most curious, since it contains a wealth of information, comprising not merely the history and growth of each school but of every name connected therewith in any way famous, from every walk of life. In a work of such magnitude it would be strange if mistakes were wholly absent. On page 216 it was the 74th Highlanders and not the 73rd which went down with the *Birkenhead*. This may be a misprint, like several others which we have noticed.

The current *Statistical Account of the Seven Colonies of Australasia*, 1899-1900,¹ by Mr. T. A. Coghlan, Statistician of New South Wales, has increased in bulk and extended in the scope of its information. This has been necessitated chiefly by the new conditions brought into existence by the creation of the new Commonwealth. A short account of the Federal movement was only to be expected, but the editor has, in our opinion, very wisely added short historical sketches of each colony, thus increasing very considerably the value of the book. The statistics are, as usual, well up to date, carefully compiled, and thoroughly reliable.

¹ *A Statistical Account of the Seven Colonies of Australasia, 1899-1900.* By T. A. Coghlan, Statistician of New South Wales. Eighth Issue. Sydney: William Applegate Gullick, Government Printer. 1900.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE new revised edition of Mr. Vickers' *History of Herod*¹ contains some alterations and additions which, however, do not affect the character of the book as a vindication of Herod. The author writes in the spirit of an advocate, but the portrait which he draws of Herod is not essentially different from the account given by Josephus. The result of Mr. Vickers' careful investigation is to show that Herod was not as black as some previous writers have painted him. He offended the Jewish priesthood by his opposition to the rigid tenets of Judaism, and his family troubles were the result of unhappy circumstances rather than of his own wickedness. We can scarcely agree with Mr. Vickers as to Herod's conduct with regard to Mariamne's execution. On the whole, the volume is candid and judicious, and is an important contribution to historical literature.

Lieutenant-Colonel Edward Gorton has written a volume entitled, *Some Home Truths re the Maori War, 1863 to 1869*,² which will interest both politicians and military men. The principal object of the book is to show that the Governor of New Zealand at the period, Sir George Grey, unwarrantably interfered with Lieutenant-General Sir D. A. Cameron, and that this made the task of the latter in bringing the war to a successful termination very difficult. As the late Governor and General Cameron are both now dead, they are personally unaffected by the allegations of Colonel Gorton save in so far as their reputations may be affected by the remarkable statements in these pages. The author does not hesitate to attribute to the late Sir George Grey a violation of truth, giving as his authority Mr. Charles Brown, formerly Superintendent of Taranaki, who was represented by the Governor as having warned him of danger to the town of New Plymouth and the probability of a massacre of women and children. The difficulty raised by the publication of the volume is that the late Sir George Grey has now no opportunity of vindicating his character. While we cannot venture to pronounce any dogmatic opinion on the subject-matter of the volume with reference to purely personal questions, we must pay a tribute to the author for the vivid and interesting picture he has given of his own experiences in the campaign. The closing sentences in the book deserve attention, as they have some bearing on the wretched South African conflict: "There is no doubt that one of the results of the war now going on in South Africa against the Boers will be

¹ *The History of Herod, or Another Look at a Man emerging from Twenty Centuries of Calumny.* By John Vickers. New Revised Edition. London: Williams & Norgate.

² *Some Home Truths re the Maori War, 1863 to 1869.* By Lieutenant-Colonel Edward Gorton. London: Greening & Co., Ltd.

necessary reforms in various departments of the army ; and it is to be hoped that the same opportunity will be taken to make a general commanding an army in the field in time of war absolutely independent, as regards his military operations, of the Governor of the country in which he may be serving, and thus prevent such disastrous consequences as have occurred in New Zealand and other countries." Of the "disastrous consequences" in South Africa we have not yet heard the end.

Un An de Caserne,¹ by M. Louis Lamarque, is a personal account of a French soldier's life for one year. It is a sad record, written, as M. Octave Mirbeau says in the preface to the book, "avec une tristesse profonde et une profonde pitié." The tyranny of a soldier's immediate superiors is painfully delineated. In the French army the "bleu" (the recruit) is treated as a mere machine. The writer of this true history says the happiest day of his life was the day when he left the army.

Cassell's *History of the Boer War*² gives a very vivid and, on the whole, fairly impartial account of the wretched struggle in which England has been engaged against the two South African Republics. Mr. Richard Danes is obviously familiar with all the incidents in the campaign. He writes in a rather unfinished style. Take, for example, this sentence in the closing page of the volume: "The youth of England rose from the apathy engendered by years of peace, and they, too, clamoured for the privilege of fighting, while the world gazed at the nation of shopkeepers transformed, at the call of the bugle, to a nation of warriors." This sort of writing is only fit for schoolboys. The illustrations in the volume are numerous, and some of them are excellent.

*The March of the Ten Thousand*³ is the title of Mr. H. G. Dakyns's admirable translation of Xenophon's *Anabasis*. The introductory sketch of Xenophon's life is a most carefully written piece of biography. Xenophon, as the friend of Plato and the disciple of Socrates, deserves a very prominent place in the annals of ancient Greece.

MM. Durrieux and Fauvelle have in their delightful work, *Samarkand la Bien Gardée*,⁴ given a most vivid, picturesque, and fascinating account of their journey, from the Caspian to Bokon, then to Krasnovadok, and subsequently to Merv, Samarkand and Bokhara. The authors saw everything worth seeing, and entered fully into the strange and dreamlike existence of the people of

¹ *Un An de Caserne*. Par Louis Lamarque. Préface d'Octave Mirbeau. Paris: P. V. Stock.

² *Cassell's History of the Boer War, 1899-1901*. By Richard Danes. Illustrated. London: Cassell & Co., Ltd.

³ *The March of the Ten Thousand*. Being a Translation of the *Anabasis*. Preceded by a Life of Xenophon. By H. G. Dakyns. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.

⁴ *Samarkand la Bien Gardée*. Par A. Durrieux et R. Fauvelle. Paris: Librairie Plon. Nourrit et Cie.

Turkestan. The chapter dealing with the future contest between England and Russia for India is startling. The triumph of Russia is confidently predicted. The book is illustrated by a number of admirable photographs.

Mr. J. S. Lindsay's *Problems and Exercises in English History*,¹ is a remarkable example of industry and scholarship. The series of which the part now issued forms "Book B," dealing with English history from 1399 to 1603, will consist of eight books, and it is believed that it will constitute "an entirely new departure in educational apparatus for the study and teaching of history." Sixty typical questions are given in this part arranged in the form of twelve one-hour test papers. Hints are given on answering questions on history, and there is a select list of books useful for teacher and learner. In our opinion many of the questions are too difficult—*eg.*, "State briefly the causes and effects of the Wars of the Roses. Such a question might puzzle an historian !

¹ *Problems and Exercises in English History*. Book B (1399-1603). By J. S. Lindsay. Cambridge : Hefter & Sons.

BELLES LETTRES.

THE fifth volume of *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift*,¹ edited by Mr. Temple Scott, contains some of Swift's contributions to the political literature of his time. Although these writings, as the editor points out in his preface, are the expression of a party point of view, they are remarkable for their lucidity, their eloquence, their satirical power, and their extraordinary grasp of political principles. The *Short Character of Thomas Earl of Wharton* is a terrible example of Swift's capacity for destroying the reputation of a political opponent. The character of Wharton was bad, but Swift blackened it so that it is perfectly villainous. "He is without the sense of shame or glory," writes this ruthless satirist, "as some men are without the sense of smelling; and, therefore, a good name to him is no more than a precious ointment would be to those. Whoever were to describe the nature of a serpent, a wolf, a crocodile or a fox, must be understood to do it for the sake of others, without any personal love or hatred for the animals themselves." Wharton is represented as an unblushing liar, a libertine, and a man who was never known "to refuse or keep a promise." The pamphlet entitled "The Conduct of the Allies" is a splendid example of Swift's power to sustain a Ministry by the subtlety and strength of his arguments, for he combined keen insight with force of expression. The portion of the volume which throws light on the quarrel between Swift and Steele will interest the student of literature. Though logically Swift had the better of his former friend, it is impossible not to sympathise with Steele. The editor has exhibited great judgment and research, and many of the notes in the volume supply very valuable information as to the period in which Swift lived; but Mr. Temple Scott's style is not to be commended. It smacks too much of "Americanese." Surely it is not refined English to write: "He was grudgingly retired from the arena of active politics." It is correct to speak of a public man *retiring*, but not of his being *retired*.

The July section of the *New English Dictionary*² completes the letter "J" and brings us down to the word "Kairine." How many non-medical persons know the meaning of the latter word? "Kairine" is "a chinoline compound oxy-methyl-quinoline tetrahydride sometimes used in medicine as a strong antipyretic." Shades of Samuel Johnson! What a bewildering explanation! However, a quotation from the *Times* informs us that the mysterious substance

¹ *The Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D.* Edited by Temple Scott. Vol. V. Historical and Political Tracts—English. London: George Bell & Sons.

² *A New English Dictionary.* Edited by Dr. James A. H. Murray. Vol. V.: JAW-KAIRINE. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press.

can be obtained from coal-tar, and "greatly resembles quinine in its action on the human species." The greatest pains have manifestly been bestowed on the history of words and even on dialectical peculiarities of expression. But evidently the learned editor never heard of the Dublinism, "Jew-man." No Dubliner of the lower class ever speaks of a Jew save as a "Jew-man." The Pembrokeshire dialectical phrase "He saw a man *just dead*," meaning "about to die," is illustrated by a quotation from the *Daily News*.

Mme. Adrienne Cambry is a writer of real talent, and the principal story in her last volume, *Trio d'Amour*,¹ would be perfect if she did not end it by destroying the entire illusion she has succeeded in creating. It is the history of a young man perplexed by his admiration for three charming girls. Finally, he resolves to marry the most intellectual of the three, when he finds that she is unwilling to marry one so fickle in his attachments. Accordingly the story ends—nowhere. The other story, *Dernier Rayon*, is concerned with the love of a middle-aged literary man for a young girl. The end is exceedingly pathetic. The style of this clever writer is very beautiful. It is to be regretted that the subject-matter is so evanescent.

Mr. T. Fisher Unwin has published a book entitled *Colloquies of Criticism*,² which, under the form of dialogues, presents us with a somewhat unusual view of the tendencies of contemporary fiction. Sir John Prichard, described as a "banker, littérateur and M.P.," assumes the tone of an oracle on literary questions, and the other speakers in those dialogues, Mr. Unwin and Miss Unwin, are equally dogmatic. At the same time, they all give "reasons for the faith that is in them." It is suggested that the necessity nowadays of appealing to the great middle-class, instead of "the polite world," has lowered imaginative literature. "If the writer of novels," remarks Sir John Prichard, "had to please the few before they could reach the many, the literature of fiction would gain." While much cannot be said for the good taste or humility of those who arrogate to themselves the title of "the polite world," it must be acknowledged that the appeal to the multitude, many of whom are necessarily unenlightened on æsthetic subjects, is calculated to lower style and to make literature unliterary. Stendhal dedicated one of his novels to the happy few." If all the readers of fiction were people of culture or critical acumen, Mr. Rudyard Kipling, Mr. Hall Caine, Mr. Rider Haggard, and Miss Marie Corelli would not be allowed to obtrude their productions on a book-ridden public.

Giacomo Leopardi, Novello Epicuro,³ by Signor G. Cargnelli, is a

¹ *Trio d'Amour*. Par Adrienne Cambry. Paris: Librairie Plon.

² *Colloquies of Criticism*. By —. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

³ *Giacomo Leopardi, Novello Epicuro*. Di G. Cargnelli. Con Lettera del Dott. Diodoro Grasso. Palermo: Stab. Tip. Era Nova.

volume of interesting criticism on the works of the Italian poet, whose name deserves to be linked with the great names of Byron and Shelley. The introductory letter by Dott. Diodoro Grasso is an appreciative view of Leopardi's true position in literature.

There is a great deal of cleverness in portions of *The Little Tin Gods*,¹ by Jessie E. Livesay. The story is rather unconventional and the ending is inexpressibly sad. We regret to find some pages in a really good novel disfigured by such vulgarity as the following dialogue:

"'Carr is an awfully good sort. What did you think of him, Judy?'

"She shrugged her shoulders.

"'Heavy, I should say, but I barely glanced at him. I am glad you are going to dine with him, though.'

"'Oh, Lord! how times have changed! We used to be chums at the 'Varsity; he is an old Etonian, too, and now I am not in a five-acre field with him.'

"'I suppose he has £ s. d. ?'

"'Any amount, and I haven't a stiver,' returned Hugh bitterly."

If this is a specimen of the conversation of ladies and gentlemen nowadays, one cannot help wishing to bring back the "good old times."

The Virgin and the Scales,² by Agnes Dawson, is a delightful story. The heroine, Ethelinda, is a charming creation. We entirely share in her admiration for *Tom Jones*, the masterpiece of English fiction, which should be read by all the prudes and pharisees of to-day in order to improve their morals and their manners.

*The Chicot Papers*³ contains 170 pages of most mirth-kindling prose. Many of the sketches in the volume have quite a Thackerayan flavour. The sketch entitled "Paddy—as a Holiday Host," recalls some of the best pages of *The Irish Sketch-book*. We must congratulate Mr. Keble Howard on the spontaneous and delightful character of his humour. Tom Brown's illustrations are exceedingly good.

The Matriculation Directory for June, 1901,⁴ in the University Tutorial Series, will furnish students with all the information they require. The questions for the matriculation examinations and the answers to them form a very interesting portion of the volume.

Mr. Cosmo Hamilton's *Impertinent Dialogues*⁵ have the merit of painting the "smart" society of the day faithfully. It is sad to think that nowadays duchesses talk idiotic slang, and that the

¹ *The Little Tin Gods*. By Jessie E. Livesay. London: Hurst & Blackett, Ltd.

² *The Virgin and the Scales*. By Agnes Dawson. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

³ *The Chicot Papers*. By Keble Howard ("Chicot"). With Sketches by Tom Brown. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

⁴ *Matriculation Directory*. No. XXX. June 1901. Burlington House, Cambridge.

⁵ *Impertinent Dialogues*. By Cosmo Hamilton. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

so-called "upper ten" are brainless noodles. The truth is that the people who are portrayed in these clever dialogues are not the better classes, but a pack of degenerates. The political dialogues are rather too cloudy to be effective. The little dramatic sketch entitled "Lights Out" is the best thing in the book.

The title of M. Jules Pravioux's charming novel—*Un Vieux Célibataire*¹—will give the reader some indication of the subject of the book. But it is necessary to read the volume carefully to form an idea of the subtle charm of the author's style. The story is the experience of an old French curé told by himself. There is humour, satire, and some pathos in this tale. M. Pravioux has written, if not a masterpiece, certainly, a beautiful story.

L'Idée Sociale au Theatre,² by M. Emile de Saint-Auban, is a deeply interesting study of some of the recent developments of the drama in France. The anarchistic drama, of which *Le Cage* is a striking example, is brilliantly analysed. The author also deals with feminism, divorce, and the marriage of priests, and his criticism of the plays written on these remarkable themes is exceedingly logical and convincing. In spite of the efforts of George Sand and of M. Zola, M. de Saint-Auban does not consider that a good drama of rural life has yet seen the light in France.

¹ *Un Vieux Célibataire*. Par Jules Pravioux. Paris: Librairie Plon ; Nourrit et Cie.

² *L'Idée Sociale au Theatre*. Par Emile de Saint-Auban. Paris: P. V. Stock.

POETRY.

It is very hard to write a good parody. The author of *Herod through the Opera Glass*¹ has not been successful, though he spares no trouble to be grotesque. Mr. Stephen Phillips' *Herod* might lend itself to parody; but the task requires an abler writer than Mr. Reginald J. Farrer.

The Complete Works of C. S. Calverley,² published by Messrs. George Bell and Son, will enable the admirers of that clever writer of comic verse and of translations both from Latin and into that language, to possess in one substantial volume all that he has written. Some of Calverley's verses were trivial; a few were perfect of their kind. The sympathetic biographical notice by Sir Walter J. Sendall does justice to Calverley's noble character.

A beautiful edition of the *Sonnets and Songs of Sir Philip Sidney*³ has been issued by Mr. Thomas Burleigh, of Cecil Court, London. The editor, Mr. Philip Sidney, has written a luminous introduction, in which an interesting account is given of the poet and his gifted sister, Mary Sidney.

Mr. Charles Whitworth Wynne has brought out a new edition of his *Songs and Lyrics*.⁴ Some of the verses in the volume are not of the highest quality. The title, "We Look Before and After," borrowed from Shelley's sublime lyric, suggests a poem commencing thus:

"Pleasant it is when woods are green,
And winds sing soft and low,
To sit beneath the budding thorn
With venturous thoughts aglow."

How trite! How puerile! The four lines on the last page headed "Truth" are the best in the volume:

"A will-o'-the-wisp that ever evades the sight.
The nearer we get the blacker grows the night;
And he who would grasp it, grasps but a reedy light,
While over his sinking shadow it dances bright."

*Ad Astra*⁵ is an ambitious poem, but singularly platitudinous. The subject is not very clear. Mr. Wynne seems to be anxious to silence the agnosticism of the age. He preaches in this fashion:

¹ *Herod through the Opera-Glass*. By Reginald J. Farrer. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell. London: Simpkin, Marshall.

² *The Complete Works of C. S. Calverley*. With a Biographical Notice by Sir Walter J. Sendall, G.C.M.G., Governor of Guiana. London: George Bell & Son.

³ *Sonnets and Songs of Sir Philip Sidney*. Edited by Philip Sidney, F.R. Hist. S. London: Thomas Burleigh.

⁴ *Songs and Lyrics*. By Charles Whitworth Wynne. London: Grant Richards.

⁵ *Ad Astra*. By Charles Whitworth Wynne. London: Grant Richards.

"Heredity! thy awful laws reveal
The fearful criminality of sin."

And again he says :

"Attribute not thy sorrow to the Lord!
If not to fault or folly of thine own,
The vices of thine ancestors afford
Sufficient cause to break and drag thee down.
Disease and death by man's own hand are sown."

The banality of the poem is oppressive. After reading it, even Young's *Night Thoughts* would be welcome. If such "poetry" finds readers nowadays, can we wonder at Carlyle's remark as to human fatuity?

The volume in Messrs. Methuen and Co.'s *Little Library* entitled *Selections from the Works of William Blake*¹ will be appreciated by all admirers of the gifted artist and poet, whose amazing originality was mistaken by some English Philistines for insanity. The introduction by Mr. Mark Perugini is luminous and, at the same time, critical. Blake's poetry has serious faults of structure, but it contains some flashes of genius. How exquisite is this passage in the lines "To the Evening Star":

"Let thy west wind
Sleep on the lake; speak silence with thy glimmering eyes,
And wash the dusk with silver."

Like Matthew Arnold, Blake is a poet's poet; he inspires other souls with poetic emotion.

¹ *Selections from the Works of William Blake*. With an Introduction and Notes by Mark Perugini. London: Methuen & Co.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLVI. No. 4.—OCTOBER 1901.

UNIVERSAL PEACE.

I.

The one supreme impediment to the eternal peace we sigh for, and the utterly unpardonable wickedness and folly of the wreckers that have thrown it in our way.

WHO in the war of the Spanish succession sought to force a thick-lipped Austrian usurper on the Spanish throne against the will of the people and of the late king? *Nominal Liberals*. Who forced on the ludicrously wicked war of "Jenkins's ear"? *Soi-disant patriots*. Who maddened France and deluged Europe with blood for a quarter of a century? A *nominal Liberal*—Burke. Who aided and abetted the jingoes in violating the peace of Amiens by retaining Malta instead of restoring it to its lawful owner, Italy, from whom it had been stolen by a sceptred highwayman? *Nominal Liberals*. Who, with devilish malignity, nicknamed the peace of Amiens "a Regicide Peace"? The aforesaid Burke. Who prevented Fox from making peace with France? *Nominal Liberals* again—the Grenville lot. Who never once opened their lips against the hundred-days war, in which we forced upon France an effete race of kings that she loathed? *Nominal Liberals*. Who waged the most infamous war that ever disgraced humanity—the Opium War with China? *Nominal Liberals*—Melbourne and Co. Who was at the bottom of perhaps the most senseless war that ever was—the Crimean war? A *nominal Liberal*, the hail, fellow! well met, of the very worst of wholesale murderers—Napoleon the Third—Lord Palmerston. Who stole Egypt and exiled the only patriot that unhappy land ever produced? *Nominal Liberals*, who have since shown themselves in their true colours, and alas, a most true Liberal too, betrayed by them into the snare. And lastly, who are now

aiding and abetting the jingoes in this most wicked war? *Nominal Liberals*—the Laodiceans, neither hot nor cold, whom the exile of Patmos “spat out of his mouth,” like so many dead-alive snails; the time-serving Byendses; the Cheiropterous bats of the Greek fabulist; “the wolves in sheep’s clothing” of the Sermon on the Mount; the “false brethren,” the last but not the least “peril” of the Apostle—Liberal Imperialists. David paid a most bitter penalty for accepting the services of “the sons of Zeruiah,” and so shall we. Not till he had pruned away all half-hearted followers did Gideon, the son of Joash, deliver his people from servitude, and shall not we cast from us and utterly disown such treacherous, snake-in-the-grass Judases? And now mark the consequences. Already, through our miserable imbecility, we have the blame of the Jenkins’s ear war and the Crimean war; and now when people begin to see this war in its true light, the Conservatives will turn round upon us and say, “Your best and ablest men, who now occupy prominent places in your Cabinet, approved of the war.” “From such” you were solemnly bidden by the Apostle to “withdraw yourselves” and to hold no communication with them, “No, not to eat;” yet, in spite of the example of the Psalmist and the warning of the Preacher, “you desired their dainty meats and clinked glasses at the feast that impious Belshazzar held in their honour.” Thus will all true Liberals lose the credit of their hard and bitter struggle with the destroyer during the last two years. The extreme folly of thus blasphemously making a trivial game at cricket of the most vital of all political questions is, perhaps, nowhere seen better than in the Crimean war. In that war there was very little, I might almost say no wickedness, except, indeed, on the part of the Jingo press, but there was the very acme of senseless folly. Our Ministry at that time were all, with the one exception of Palmerston, the very best of men, and hated war with their whole hearts; and the Czar was a truly noble creature, a lover and admirer of England, and would never have gone to war had he only known. But whilst he was engaged in quite friendly negotiation with Turkey our ambassador at the Porte must needs so intermeddle as to pledge our national honour to armed interference in a quarrel in which we had no concern whatever. The Ministry, “harmless as doves,” but by no means “wise as serpents,” was so morally imbecile—alas, that from the Fall until now the good should be fragile as glass whilst the evil is hard as adamant—as not instantly to recall and disown the mischief-maker. And then the jingoes of the press took the matter up, and before the Ministry had time to wake up from their opiate lethargy in which, once more in Paradise, they were dreaming a sweet, happy, heaven-lit dream of eternal peace, there was no staying the progress of the war-plague that raged at once like a devouring flood of fire throughout the land. And that is why I borrow the tongue of an *Ezekiel* to denounce the Asquith

raid. I am the most tolerant of mankind. Those who allow me no other merit allow me that. The lame, the crippled, the deaf, the dumb, and the blind—all, however weak, decrepit and incapable—are welcome to fight as best they can under our banner. But *not* the plague-smitten. And war is at once the most deadly and the most infectious of all plagues. There is the very best possible reason to believe that modern England is going down the self-same steep incline as ancient Rome to utter ruin with ever-increasing velocity; and the English are at once the proudest and the most combative of Aryan races, and consequently the most susceptible of the said plague. Were I therefore, a schoolmaster, I would far sooner admit a boy with scarlet fever upon him, than as a party leader I would admit the Asquith conspirators into my ranks. They may deplore the Boer ultimatum and censure the Boer Jingoos as much as they please. I, myself, of course, admit that when the Boers invaded our territory there was nothing for it but to fight them and drive them out. But here the Crimean war and the Transvaal war run on exactly parallel lines. After the Turks had successfully repelled the Russian invasion the war should have been concluded at once, and its continuance under the evil influence of Palmerston and Napoleon the Third (a precious pair truly—*Arcades umbo*) was a national crime. And still more now that the Boers have not only been driven from our territory but are reduced to the utmost possible distress in their own, the war should long ago have been concluded, and its continuation has been and is more and more every day so much utterly unnecessary and therefore utterly inexcusable wholesale murder. Such is the view of all true Liberals. But if the Liberal Imperialists hold that the conduct of the present Government was not, and is not, truly damnable in that by a detestable combination of insolence, deceit, and bad faith they forced the Boers and tricked us into the war, and are still continuing it, and intend to do so till they have crushed the Boers down to the finest powder and made South Africa utterly desolate—

"A solitude call'd peace—a wilderness
Peopled by brutes, its old inhabitants;
Bats, foxes, dragons, lions, jackals, owls,
And savages half-way 'twixt them and Man"—

and are prepared to treat a national crime so black altogether lightly and condone it when the Liberals come into power again, then I say that they should be disowned forthwith, and utterly stamped out at the next election.

But far too many short-sighted, not to say mole-eyed Liberals say, like the false-prophet-led Jews of old, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. And in the Liberal Cabinet of 1902 at earliest, or 1904 or 5 at latest, our leaders will, I fear, "daub the wall with untempered mortar," in spite of an inspired Ezekiel's half-delirious

outcries. Then, when the demon host of Moloch comes again to besiege us, the ill-mortared wall will dissolve, like the air-woven fabric of a vision, at the mere sound of his trumpets; the bricks will topple down and dash our brains out; the enemy will rush in like a flood; and England will have been. And this they call toleration. "Oh, Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name!" exclaimed on the scaffold the latest victim of its loathsome pseudo. And, oh! Toleration, Religion, and Free Trade, I add, what crimes are committed in yours! And when a madman flings lighted fire-brands about and miscreants sell plague-smitten raiment dirt-cheap to the poor, I am called a fanatic if I propose to shut up the one in Bedlam and to hang the other. And now Gideon's two-and-thirty thousand is reduced to three hundred, yet even so, seeing that "the fervent effectual prayer of even *one* righteous man availeth much," much more, then, that of all that think with me, be they ever so few, we may yet save England; and even if not, when she goes the way that so many kings and cities and nations have gone before her that have sinned as she has, still the New Zealand schoolboy sitting in her ruins will be taught to revere our hallowed manes.

The meaning of the present Conservative tactics is obvious. They want apostates in the next Liberal Cabinet the same as in their own. Then, when he is at last bowled out, Chamberlain will lay down his bat with a complacent smile, having had plenty of runs—so many Boers massacred, and perfectly secure of entire impunity. Poor England, with no choice but between Chamberlain and Devonshire in one Cabinet and Asquith and Fowler in the other, as far as the one most vital question of all is concerned she will be even like a shuttlecock, with no choice but with which battledore it shall be banged, or an oyster, with no choice but on which shell it shall be devoured. Oh, what miserable, cowardly, self-betrayers! What despicably tailor-hearted Peer Gynts! What invertebrate jellyfish have we been! Had we cast the Asquiths, the Fowlers, the Greys forth out of our camp we should have lost, say, thirty or forty votes. And what, pray, would that have mattered? We cannot be more utterly prostrate than we are. But when the anti-war reaction comes—as come it always has and will again—by pressing false brethren to our butter-soft bosoms and slobbering their cheeks with the kisses of a most undeserved pardon, we shall have deprived ourselves of the opportunity which we should else have had of ridding ourselves for ever of double-faced apostate traitors and ultimate deserters, and becoming a perfectly united party, and inaugurating at last the Good Time that has been so long coming. But these soi-disant Liberal Imperialists, who differ no more from Liberal Unionists than leopards from panthers or Tweedledums from Tweedledees, whilst all true Liberals differ from them as essentially—as *toto celo, totâ natura, totis omnibus rebus*—as Light from Darkness—these treacherous guides,

once admitted into our Cabinet, shall never lead us into the Promised Land of Eternal Peace—never, *never*, NEVER; but betrayed by them, even as we were by Chamberlain and Devonshire before, into the hands of Jingo mammon-worshipping Bedouins, our whitening bones will rot in the burning sands and be tossed to and fro by the wild, terrific simooms of this howling wilderness. Therefore I am no better pleased with the late reconciliation between C. B. and Asquith than Micaiah, the son of Imlah, or Obadiah and his brethren, that all but one died rather than bow the knee to Baal, would have approved of that between Pilate and Herod. Pilate was doubtless a weak but well-meaning man till then. And so was C. B.

Only consider what a long series of follies and of infamies C. B. has thereby pledged himself to condone.

When the late Ministry left office in 1895 all was peace, content, and felicity in South Africa, the two races were slowly but surely drawing together, the Dutch in Cape Colony and Natal were devoted subjects, and Boerland placidly amicable. Before the Jameson Raid of 1895 the South African Republic had only some 13,500 rifles, and one fort protected by 3 artillery-men (their artillery being, all told, only 9 officers and 150 men), and by a broken-down corrugated iron fence. It was not till *after* that infamous affair that they began to arm with all their might and main in defence of their obviously menaced freedom. Punished so trivially as it was by the Government, and sympathised with so enthusiastically as it was by the people of England, they had only too good reason to do so. But above all, after the scandalously burked inquiry at Westminster, on which all Europe cried shame, when, though Mr. Rhodes was found plainly guilty of treachery, Mr. Chamberlain, after signing the Parliamentary report to that effect, certified at the same time that there was nothing in it to reflect on Mr. Rhodes' honour, it was quite certain that Mr. Chamberlain's own honour was of too peculiar a kind to be relied upon, and it was almost certain that as Mr. Rhodes had been Mr. Jameson's, even so had Mr. Chamberlain been his accomplice. But the present Jingo, apostate-ridden Government had made up its mind to revenge Majuba, rescind the Derby Convention, make war upon the Transvaal, and then, having thoroughly well punished it, as Afghanistan and other States have been punished before now, reannex it again, but this time finally and for evermore.

As early as June 1899, Lord Wolseley wished to seize Delagoa Bay, mobilise an army corps, and appeal to the colonies for contingents, in order "to get the war over by November." Was the war, then, determined upon already? Lord Lansdowne rejected his advice, on the ground that the Cabinet wished to wait until the country was ready for war, that is to say until a war fever had set in. "We earnestly desired," he explained later on, "to have the country with

us. We believed the country was not ready for war in the months of June and July 1899, and we therefore contented ourselves with"—the usual red-tape and Blue-book windbagery.

The controversy with the wolf and the lamb then pursued its usual course—the course Rome took with Carthage in the third Punic war, and with other weak States it wished to grab, the course we ourselves have so often taken. Pretexting the wrongs of the natives—who, when the war is over, will find the scorpions of the Mammon worshippers much harder to bear than the whips of the Boers—and the wrongs of the Uitlanders, whom, as treacherous foes of Republicanism the Boers sought to keep under, and whom, as secretly plotting and planning a second reannexation, they grudgingly admitted to the franchise. Their wrongs indeed! who, under the sacred pretext of the love of liberty, sought to subject the Dutch Republics to a foreign yoke, that under our flag they might grind the faces of the poor and needy, and trample in the dust the native and the immigrant with their Pass Laws and their Flogging Bills, their trusts, their tommy shops, and what not, without restraint, and where the free Bible-Christian Boer Republics had lived so long the pure, happy, and unsophisticated lives of the Engadine and Rhine peasantry, heap up untold wealth to maintain their posterity in eternal idleness, and introduce the horrible social inequality of Johannesburg under the pretence of "developing the resources of the country and making it rich and prosperous."¹

The following is the history of the negotiations for the six weeks or so before the war broke out:

"August 19.—Mr. Kruger offers a five-years franchise as demanded, conditional on freedom from internal interference in the Transvaal."

Having employed the intervening month in feeling the British pulse, and finding that with the highly competent aid of the Jingo press the war mania was progressing as satisfactorily as could be wished,

September 22.—Mr. Chamberlain breaks off negotiations, and announces that he is considering the situation *de novo*, and that the Government will "formulate their own proposals for a final settlement"—*i.e.*, will send an ultimatum.

September 25.—The British headquarters at Ladysmith are suddenly moved north to Dundee, near the Boer frontier.

October 3.—It is semi-officially announced that an extraordinary meeting of Parliament will be called for October 17.

October 7.—The British reserves are formally called up, an army corps mobilised, and a large number of transports chartered to convey troops to South Africa.

October 9.—Irritated by all this, and learning that an army

¹ See the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for September, pp. 268-271.

corps was embodied and ready to sail, the Boers issue their ultimatum.

October 11.—The Boers declare war.

Of course this was a mistake; the lamb should not have declared war upon the wolf, though it certainly was the wolf and not he that was muddying the water, though it certainly was neither he nor his father that had slandered the wolf, but the wolf that had devoured his father and was now about to devour him. Still, though the wolf had shown his teeth and was obviously advancing to attack him, though he had the clearest possible *casus belli* by every rule of natural and international law against the wolf it was very, very foolish of him. But how was it, pray, that the member for Caithness was cried out upon as such a double-dyed traitor for advising the lamb not to do so? Why, but because he was thus counteracting the deep-laid scheme of a Jingo-ridden Government that was bent on avenging Majuba and enslaving the Boers. For had the lamb only waited to be attacked the wolf would have collapsed and proved a spectre merely.

So much for the wickedness of the policy endorsed by the Asquithites. Of its folly judge by the consequences thereof as set forth in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for September, pp. 266, 267. And those consequences are growing worse and worse month after month. For every month the debt incurred grows more insupportably heavy, and every month we lose more men and effectively occupy less territory than we did the month before. And now we are come to the last and worst stage of all—the threatened reprisals—the butchering of the wounded and the hanging of prisoners, the latter of which is all to the advantage of the Boers, for while we exile ours to the tropics they know not what on earth to do with theirs. And when we and they alike are reduced to the very last gasp of exhaustion, the Basutos, the Swazis, the Kaffirs and the Zulus may perchance seize so favourable an opportunity, like the fox in the fable.

II.

How eternal peace may be secured not for ourselves only but for the whole world.

The present state of Europe is truly frightful. In bygone years it could summon only 6,150,000 men (only!) to arms. But in 1892 it could summon 12,563,000; in 1893, 22,443,000—about one-ninth of its entire population; between one-fourth and one-fifth of its males and more than half of all capable of bearing arms. In other words, the lives of full one-half of the adult population (exclusive of the aged, the sick and the infirm) are by this single curse of curses rendered worse than useless. Such a perpetual armed peace is almost worse than a few months' war. For what is life worth thus

wasted? Not worth living. The silent grave were better. Already war has overwhelmed the various peoples of Europe and America with a frightful load of debt, amounting in all to nearly £5,000,000,000. No wonder the Czar cries out. No wonder the Socialists are so hopeful of the ultimate triumph of their cause. How then shall we stay the further progress of this all-devouring plague? How to stop it in this country I have shown in my last essay, and in this I propose to show how to stop it throughout the world. There is one infallible specific against war—an Amphictyonic Council of the thirteen Occidental and Oriental languages of civilisation (English, French, Spanish, German, Italian, Greek, Russian, Scandinavian, Hindoo, Chinese, Japanese, Islamic or Arabic, Amharic and Malagasy) to divide the world once for all amongst them, and swear eternal non-intervention with one another.

“The word, that is the man.”

People speaking the same language should form the same State—no other. Let the several provinces of each of the twelve States claim a right of deciding to which State they will now, and from henceforth, and for ever, belong. And from that time let there be no more war again for ever. But should any State make war upon another and invade its territory, then war—implacable war—with that State on the part of all the rest, till the parties truly responsible, the Government of the said guilty State, have been given up to public justice, to be tried and hanged—yes, *hanged* as murderers. Sufficiently long have the poor, *irresponsible* victims perished by the sword; will the day *never* come when selfish ambition shall be kept in awe by the looming fear of the gallows? Oh, let it be no more said or sayable as it is now: If I kill him that has wronged me deadlily and made my home a hell, I must swing for it; but if I kill myriads upon myriads of poor wretches,

“Dragg’d from the plough to feed the sword,”

that never injured me in their lives, in thought, word, or deed, I am a hero, and bards in time to come shall immortalise my glorious exploits.

But, hitherto, of all the nations of Europe, England has been the only one to attain the full proportions of her natural size. And yet nearly all the wars that have devastated Europe during the last two centuries have arisen from her heartless selfishness in stunting the normal growth of her sister nations. Notably, our wars with Louis XIV. and the Republic of '93 to keep France out of Belgium, and the Crimean war to keep the Christian Slavs still under the loathsome yoke of the unspeakable Tartar, had this object and this only. But for the insanely diabolical wickedness of our foreign policy, peace might have been secured for ever long ago throughout

all Christendom; and may be even now, only let us suffer the different European nationalities to make the several annexations of territory for the want of which they have so long writhed, like wounded snakes, convulsively.

Let Germany then acquire Germanic Austria, Germanic Switzerland and Holland; Greece: Crete, Macedon, Epirus, Cyprus, and the Archipelago; France: Alsace-Lorraine, Belgium, the Channel Isles, and the Genevese; Italy: the Grisons, Malta, the Ticinese, Savoy, Southern Tyrol, and Corsica; England: Alaska, Polynesia, Antarcadia, Couta, Tangier, and Fernando Po; Spain: Gibraltar and Portugal; Sweden: Denmark; Russia: the rest of Europe (except Thrace), Armenia and Manchuria; El Islam: Cistropical Africa, Arabia, Turkey in Asia, Persia, *all* Turkestan (both Russian and Independent), Afghanistan and Beloochistan; China: Japan, Macao, Siam, Indo-China, and Malasia. Hindostan to be a British Protectorate, its House of Commons, Hindoos; its House of Lords, Rajahs; its Vice-Chancellors and Privy Council Australo-British; and Madagascar to be a French protectorate in like manner. The twelve empires to be subdivided where desirable into two or more or many sub-kingdoms, which would enjoy perfect internal autonomy, but no separate diplomatic service. Thus Portugal, Bavaria, Illyria, Roumania, Norway, Belgium, Ireland, etc., would be all autonomous but not independent.

The United States, including the West Indies, will of course be politically independent of Great Britain, and Mexico, Central and South America, of Spain; but physically they cannot be so long as they speak the same language.

Trans-equatorial Africa to be a Republic just like the United States, and Mexico, politically independent, but physically an inalienable portion, partly of the British, and partly of the German Empire, according to the language spoken in it, which of course as an Englishman I should wish to be English. Abyssinia: the littoral below Massowah, Shoa, Somali, and all the territory between Egyptia and the sea-coast as far as the equator. When I say that this empire is to have this and that, that Russia, for instance, is to have "the rest of Europe," I merely mean of course that "the rest of Europe" is to be in its sphere of influence, within which none of the other twelve empires have any right to meddle under any pretext whatever. Lastly, as each kingdom should decide to which empire it should belong, so each province should decide to which kingdom, and each district to which province. Thus the Channel Isles should choose between England and France, each electoral district in Alsace-Lorraine between France and Germany, and each electoral district in Ulster between Great Britain and Ireland. Thus peace throughout the world would be for ever secured, and there would be no more wars at all any more for ever.

III

The appalling danger into which our forty wars during the last reign and this and our previous wars have at last brought us.

"He that takes the sword shall perish by the sword." Never nation did as we are doing and perished not. Athens never got over her unjust attempt on Sicily, nor Sparta over the oppression of Thebes. From the moment she extended her empire beyond Italy, the decline of Rome began. The conquest of Africa led to Sylla and Marius, and that of Gaul and Britain to the Cæsars. What brought Portugal under the Spanish yoke? The dazzling halo of her unsubstantial glory; the fatal witchcraft of her semi-world-wide conquests, from Tangier and the Azores to Mozambique, and from Mozambique to Bombay and Goa. What ruined Spain, once the first power in Europe? The conquest of America. What Sweden, once a match for Poland, Denmark, and Russia all together? The invasion of Germany by Gustavus Adolphus, and the sterile triumphs of Charles XII. What Holland, once the mighty rival of France and England, and the only people who ever humbled us by sea? Her foreign possessions. What Turkey? The forcible holding under her sway of so many Christian populations—Slav and Hellenic—that deadlily abhorred her.

The possession of India, at best an uncertain good, is a most certain evil, yea, the greatest of all evils, if it leads us, as it has led us, directly or indirectly, to an interminable series of aggressive wars.

We boast ourselves unconquered, so did Sparta; but only whilst she defended liberty against ambition did she triumph at Plataea and Egospotami. When she became herself the despot of Greece she fell at Leuctra to rise no more, even as we shall fall. Oh, England! be warned by the fate of Sparta!

Is it through un-English fear of Russia that I warn England against her rapidly approaching doom. No. Of France? No. Of Germany, Holland, and Austria? No. Of El Islam? No. Of Indian mutineers? No. But of all of them combined, with the sacred rights of nations fighting on their side, and the immutable laws of eternal justice. And for this I am no true patriot, am I? But which was the true patriot, Phocion or Cleon; Zedekiah, that died the death of Heliogabalus, or Micaiah the son of Imlah, that rebuked the lying spirit in him and his fellow false prophets? "Oh, woe unto him that enlarges his desires as hell, and can not be satisfied; that increaseth that which is not his, and buildeth up his house on high with blood!" And oh, woe unto us that add people after people to our empire and will never rest till the whole world is enslaved by us! And oh, woe, woe, woe, on the wars that the good

to whom England is dear indeed, but the species dearer, cannot without blasphemy pray God to bless her in ! Oh, woe, woe, woe, I say, a world-wide woe ! A *world-wide* woe indeed ! And woe to those whose *pens* "are swift to shed blood"—the organs of the press "that delight in war." And woe to ye "dumb dogs, loving to slumber," ye priests of the Establishment, that have never yet had anything to say against war, or slavery, or any other social evil the mention of which might offend the wealthy amongst your congregation, but are eloquent Boanergeses indeed when the worldly status of your order is menaced. Ye pray morning and evening, saying, "Give peace in our time, O Lord," and yet when your social influence might procure us a safe, lasting, and honourable peace, exert it all in favour of this most unchristian war, exactly as Charles V. caused prayers to be offered in all the churches for the deliverance of poor Pope Clement VII. from captivity when a word from him would have effected it. Well then might we add this one more prayer to our litany : "From all spiritual cowardice, from all worldly man-pleasing, from all fear of man rather than Thee, from all bloody-minded hypocrisy, Good Lord, deliver us." And your congregations reply, "For there is none other that fighteth for us" (a most melancholy truth ; none other certainly fights for us now that we have so utterly shocked the heart and soul of all Christendom) "but only thou, O God," as if He, who again and again in Scripture calls himself the God of peace, and who blesses and calls His children the peacemakers, whom your Jingo friends calls traitors, enemies to their native land and rebels to their king, as if He whose "peace which passeth all understanding" you invoke as the greatest of blessings, twice every Sunday on your congregations—as if He, I say, could possibly be fighting for you in a war, the utter wickedness of which the veriest atheist by the mere light of nature loathes.

Now the time is rapidly approaching when the map of Europe will be divided into four distinct colours, one for the Slavonic, one for the Teutonic, one for the Latin, and one for the Greek race ; of this we have now five unmistakable symptoms simultaneously staring us in the face : the recent treaty between Austria and Russia ; the corresponding approaches of Germany towards us necessitated by her threatened isolation ; the struggle in Italy against an unnatural alliance, to maintain which effectually she is being taxed beyond all endurance ; the duel between the Czechs and the Germans in Bohemia, which can only end in the disruption of the Teuton and the Slav races in Austria ; and lastly, the Americo-Spanish war, the meaning of which is simply this, that no European power shall henceforth rule in America without the consent of its subjects. And a very good meaning too.

Now, the possession of Gibraltar has from the first been a very

costly one for us, but the sentiment of race is making such gigantic strides that the price will ere long be monstrous. Gibraltar and the undying hatred of Spain, and ultimate war to the death with the whole Latin race in one scale, and Ceuta, and perpetual amity with Spain and the whole Latin race in the other, who can doubt which scale is the heavier?

By exchanging Gibraltar for Ceuta and ceding Malta to Italy, instead of being hated by Spain as a despoiler and despised by all Europe as a thief, we should crown ourselves with deathless glory, win a character for superhuman disinterestedness dirt cheap, appease the cruel jealousy of France, establish perpetual amity with the Latin race, escape the combination of all Europe, that crushed Napoleon and may yet crush us, win the prize for inspired wisdom by being the first to acknowledge a law that must necessarily sooner or later triumph, secure an impregnable position in the soul of humanity—a moral in lieu of a physical Gibraltar—and take the first step towards becoming, not the hated mistress, as Rome was, but the revered and beloved arbitress of the world. But, alas! I fear this is not to be. We are fast acquiring Eastern Africa, from Alexandria to the Cape. We are even now planning three gigantic railway systems, the first from the north of Scotland to Pekin, *via* London, Paris, Vienna, Constantinople, Bagdad, Ispahan, Kandahar, Delhi, Calcutta, and Canton; the second from Cairo to join the first at Bagdad; the third from Cairo to the Cape. But shall we even then be satisfied? No! The bee will tire of honey, the goat of cytiseus, the fish of the pure water of the Nile ere we shall satisfy our earthgreed. We have the eyes of Argus over all the world to reduce it under our yoke. One eye on Kordofan, one on Darfur, one on Senhaar, one on Abyssinia, one on Zambesiland, one on Central Africa, one on Arabia, one on Persia, one on Thibet, which has certainly some very fine tea, and would be at once an admirable sanatorium and an admirable field for a system of emigration that would for ever secure our possession of India; one eye on Siam, which the folly of France will in due time probably make only too willing to accept our protectorate, just as Germany's yet blinder folly is building us railways wherewith to annex Southern Turkey. And then, what think you? Why, as Europe was tired at last of Louis XIV. and Napoleon, even so will she be tired at last of you. And slowfooted Nemesis will overtake you at last, even as she overtook Greece and Rome in ancient, and Spain and France in modern times. You waged a war at the commencement of the last reign at which even the fiends of hell stood aghast—the opium war with China. And you never once wiped your mouth. Therefore you will not, I too prophetically fear, escape from the lightnings of Gehenna that have long—nay, ever since you first set foot in Hindostan—been brewing for you. The death of the late Dowager

Empress of Germany has at last untied the hands of her son. And the daily increasing barbarity with which the present war is being carried on, the utter desolation of the country, the camping of one-eighth of a million of Kaffirs and of Boer women and children who hate the camp just as the poor in this country hate the workhouse, the exiling of prisoners to die thousands of miles away from their native land, the judicial murder of so-called "Dutch rebels," with weeping kinsmen compelled to look indignantly on; the growing disaffection in Cape Colony, and the ignoble arming of the black population, all seem to indicate the approach of German interposition in one form or other, now that the Dowager Empress is gone, and Lord Kitchener has excited the indignation of all Europe, and of Germany and Holland especially, by his late proclamation in utterly heathenish defiance of all the laws of war, and yet later by his abominable threat of reprisals which, outwardly fair, will prove inwardly most Bashibazoukish. Not that Germany would be so mad as to intervene in South Africa against a quarter of a million of bayonets; but in Europe, backed by France and Russia, she may, nay, sooner or later *must*, protest, and we comply or prepare ourselves for utter and irremediable ruin.

To conclude, then, I desire peace above all things—(1) for its own sake; (2) as our only escape from the else inevitable doom that even the oldest of us may yet live to see; (3) as the necessary means of securing thorough internal and external Parliamentary reform, whereby we shall make sure of every national blessing that the wit of man can conceive or heart desire.

F. A. WHITE.

LIBERALS, FORWARD! MARCH!!

DINING and whining has been the order of the day in the Liberal party for some time past, and unless the unexpected should happen, and a thorough shaking of the dry bones of the party take place, it will, peradventure, go on dining and whining till the end of time. "Liberal Imperialists," "Liberals without an adjective," and Liberals who are "neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring," have spoken postprandially and otherwise; Lord Rosebery, that "disembodied spirit" who hovers uneasily on the border-line between Liberalism and Toryism, has, in addition to a speech, unburdened his soul in a letter a full column long to the City Liberal Club—very much "City" and very little "Liberal," we fear; and the net result of all the pother is to demonstrate that the positions of one and all of them, "Liberal Imperialist," "Liberal without adjective," and "disembodied spirit" alike, are absolutely untenable.

In his letter Lord Rosebery showed very clearly how impossible is the position of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, condemning yet voting supplies for the war, and as leader of the Liberal party striving to straddle at one and the same time two steeds careering in totally opposite directions.

"The whole Empire," wrote his Lordship, "has rallied to the war. What is the attitude of the Liberal party? Neutrality and an open mind. Now, I contend that this is an impossible attitude, and only spells Liberal impotence. No party can exist on such conditions. The area of comprehension is too wide. On this question it embraces the human race. And this question is vital, morally and politically.

"Morally, either the war is just or unjust, either the methods are uncivilised or legitimate. If the war be unjust and its methods uncivilised our Government and our nation are criminal, and the war should be stopped at any cost. If the war be just, carried on by means which are necessary and lawful, it is our duty to support it with all our might in order to bring it to a prompt and successful conclusion. These are supreme issues; none greater ever divided two hostile parties. How then can one party agree to differ on them? Cavaliers and Roundheads might almost as well have combined on the basis of each maintaining their different opinions on the policy of Charles I."

And at the Asquith dinner Sir Henry Fowler put the matter in a nutshell:

"He held that war, awful, deadly, unspeakable calamity as it was, was either a necessity or a crime. If he had thought the present war was a

crime, he would not have voted a single shilling or risked a single life on behalf of it."

Speaking at Peterborough, Sir Edward Grey, while endeavouring to maintain the soundness of the lion-and-the-lamb attitude adopted at the Reform Club meeting, roundly retorted that Lord Rosebery's own attitude of aloofness is an impossible one.

"He would suggest," he said, "that if Lord Rosebery desired the Liberal party to be brought to one mind on the matter he should go a good deal beyond his letter. He should step in from outside and use his personal influence to promote that one mind. Lord Rosebery had also said that they thought the position taken up at the Reform Club was an impossible one, which could not last. He would say to Lord Rosebery in return that the position he took up in his letter was an impossible one. The position of standing aside from party politics was one that could not last"—

And the impossible character of the Liberal Imperialist position—his own, Sir Edward Grey's, Mr. Asquith's, Sir Henry Fowler's, in fact the position of all of that ilk—was made manifest in Lord Rosebery's egregious speech at the City Liberal Club. Returning to the main contention in his letter, "that it was impossible that the two sections (pro-war and anti-war) could continue to exist under the same standard," Lord Rosebery, unfortunately for himself and the pro-war section of the party, proceeded to give reasons for the faith, or want of faith, that is in him, and in so doing gave himself and his case away.

"I have no hesitation," he continued, "in stating exactly my view of the war. I give it in the common stock—to quote another remark of Lord Tweedmouth's—for what it is worth. I pass by altogether the negotiations precedent to the war, although I should have much to say of them if they were practical questions. I pass by the Jameson Raid, although I should fully acknowledge the responsibility of the Jameson Raid for what has followed. I pass by—it was not mentioned at the National Reform Union, although the Raid was mentioned—the not less serious fact of the hushing up by the South African Committee, to which two of the speakers at the National Reform Union were prominent parties. I pass by that, although in my honour and conscience I believe nothing has had a more disastrous effect on the nations of the civilised world than the action of the South African Committee in hushing up the proper subject which it was set to investigate. I pass by all that. My point of departure is that, in spite of the Jameson Raid, in spite of the South African Committee, in spite of clumsy negotiations, the army of the Boers crossed the frontier and invaded the dominions of the Queen. From that moment to this I have had no hesitation about the course that I would take, that, though I would criticise the methods of the Government when, as so often they have been, lamentably short of what the occasion required, yet that in their main issue to carry the war to a triumphal and rapid and quick close they should have my warmest and most enthusiastic support. Well, I say then that is a departure from the main paths of my argument. My view is not whether the war was right or wrong—the view, that is, I was discussing in my letter—but whether a party, on such a question as that, can afford to combine both sections—that which considers the war as right,

at least, in the sense that I consider it right; and that which considers it utterly wrong, and carried on by methods of barbarism. Is it possible for any party that hopes to secure the attention and the allegiance of the country, and later on, perhaps, even to secure its confidence, to preserve an open mind? An open mind! That stabs the very heart of Empire."

"Oh, my Heavens!" as Lord Rosebery himself would say, what balderdash, what absolute nonsense from an ex-Foreign Minister!

In *what* sense does his lordship consider the war to be right?

It should surely be obvious to the meanest intelligence that in estimating the justice or injustice of the war "the negotiations precedent to the war," the inflammatory and mendacious speeches and dispatches both of Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Alfred (now Lord) Milner, the Jameson Raid, "the hushing up by the South African Committee," the failure of that Committee to insist upon the production of "the Hawkesley dossier," and secure the conviction and punishment of all implicated in the Raid, are of the very essence of the case; and that to "pass by" these is but the dishonest artifice of a politician who, not practical enough to know that in politics as in all else honesty is the best policy, seeks to cloak his cowardice and excuse his shouting with the mob when it goes a-maflucking.

"My point of departure," he says, forsooth! "is that *in spite* of the Jameson Raid, *in spite* of the South African Committee, *in spite* of clumsy negotiations, the army of the Boers crossed the frontier and invaded the dominions of the Queen"! What a feeble, clumsy palterer is this! The truth but stands out the clearer for all his petty shuffling. Manifestly the true "point of departure" is rather that *because* of the Jameson Raid, *because* of the South African Committee, *because* of clumsy negotiations (to characterise them by no harsher epithet), "the army of the Boers crossed the frontier and invaded the dominions of the Queen." Manifestly the truth is that the Boers were simply "jockeyed" in most unscrupulous fashion into the war, "jockeyed" into it in so artful a manner as to seem to put them in the wrong.

The damning sequence of cause and effect unwittingly brought out in such bold relief by Lord Rosebery's maladroitness, is absolutely unanswerable. The Liberal Imperialists cannot explain away the Raid, the "Committee of No Inquiry," nor the "clumsy negotiations." They cannot produce the Hawkesley letters and telegrams, and it is very evident that Mr. Chamberlain, who can produce them, *dare not do so.*

Unless and until the Hawkesley dossier is produced, unless and until the complicity of the Colonial Secretary in the Jameson Raid is disproved by the clearest possible evidence, the position of the pro-war party cannot be made good. In the *National Review* Sir Edward Grey has attempted to defend his attitude as a Liberal Imperialist, but in spite of the fact that he is much more adroit in his statement of the case than was Lord Rosebery, the

article merely succeeds in demonstrating once more how utterly untenable is the pro-war position. Admitting the iniquity of the Raid, admitting that the proceedings of the Committee of Inquiry were not, to say the least of it, above suspicion, admitting that the two Republics armed after the Raid, he will yet have it that the Boers armed, not in self-defence, but in furtherance of Dutch "political ambitions" to drive us out of South Africa! No tangible evidence in support of this conspiracy theory has yet been brought forward; and stripped of all verbiage and cleared from all side issues, his argument is so palpably preposterous that one can only wonder at his temerity in allowing it to appear in print.

In view of their own admissions, in view, further, of the fact that Mr. Chamberlain admitted that the Boers had granted nine-tenths of our demands, and that the other tenth was not worth fighting for, in view of the fact that the Boers repeatedly urged that all matters in dispute should be referred to arbitration, this being indeed the first point in their so-called "insolent ultimatum"; in view, moreover, of Lord Lansdowne's admission that as early as June 1899—months before the ultimatum was issued—Lord Wolseley had proposed that the Government should seize Delagoa Bay and complete the subjugation of the *two* Republics by November of that year, it is difficult indeed to see how one can credit with both common sense and common honesty those who, with Mr. Asquith,¹

"hold that the war was neither intended nor desired by the Government and people of Great Britain, but that it was forced upon them without adequate reason."

Small wonder that so audacious a statement was greeted with cries of "Chamberlain!" and interruptions.

The greater the honesty of purpose with which one credits these men, the less must be their intelligence. The greater their intelligence, the less their honesty.

It is no use attempting to shirk the issue. Either the war is just and necessary, and ought to be supported; or the war is unjust and unnecessary and should be stopped forthwith, and we must, as best we may, recompense its victims for the evil we have wrought. We can rebuild their homes and replace their flocks and herds, but we cannot give them back their dead. Nor, alas, can we call back to life our own 17,000 buried beneath the veldt. And how can any reasonable man maintain that it is just and necessary to make war upon an opponent who is not only willing but anxious to refer all matters in dispute to arbitration? How can there be room in any party worthy the name of Liberal for men who venture to support and attempt to justify a war forced upon such an opponent?

¹ Liverpool Street Station Hotel dinner, June 20, 1901.

What, then, should be the attitude of the Liberal party in regard to this matter?

Lord Rosebery, whose only too successful intervention to prevent this country fulfilling her treaty obligations to protect the Armenians from wholesale massacre entitles him to take a high moral stand in regard to foreign policy, was stirred to the depths of his being by the National Reform Union and Queen's Hall meetings. These meetings, he said, at the City Liberal Club,

"made me feel that unless there was some clear repudiation of the statements in regard to the war in which we are unfortunately engaged, unless there was some repudiation, it was impossible that the Liberal party should continue to exist, and exist as a sound force appealing to the highest sympathies of the country."

And the good man came all the way from his "lonely corner of the Tyrol" to repudiate these statements. He feared that, as after the great war with France, the Liberal party might have to spend nearly forty years in the wilderness of Opposition, and he wished to warn the titular leaders of the party

"that statesmen who dissociate themselves from the nation in a great national question, such as a war, in which all strive and suffer together, dissociate themselves for much longer than they think."

His lordship recognised, it is true, that

"that is a consideration which should not weigh for an instant against conviction. But (he continued, somewhat illogically, unless politicians are supposed to have no convictions) it is one which should not be forgotten by politicians, who do not desire to see the government of this country fall permanently into the hands of their opponents, and the indefinite postponement of their own domestic policy."

* What is this but "the cult of the jumping cat"?

"The whole Empire," says his lordship, in effect, "has rallied to the war, and unless they would relinquish all hope of the sweets of office, and all hope of realising their domestic policy, the Liberal party must also rally to the war."

But that the whole Empire rallied to the war is in the first place a gross exaggeration. There has always been a very respectable minority—respectable as regards both numbers and intelligence—strongly opposed to the war; and though a majority rallied to the war, that majority was hoodwinked, cozened, and bamboozled by unscrupulous politicians and by a lying Press. That majority, moreover, is steadily dwindling as one by one the lies and the subterfuges of the promoters of the war are exposed. This the Government clearly realised last autumn, and hence their hurried appeal to the country on a stale register and on a false issue. Some 500,000 men were disfranchised by reason of the staleness of the register, there are some 600,000 plural voters, some 8,000,000 adult males

have no votes at all, not one woman has a vote, yet Lord Rosebery tells us that "the nation has only just chosen its Parliament, and so its Government, by an overwhelming majority"! It will be time, one would think, to saddle the nation with such folly when the nation has a really effective voice in the matter. As a matter of fact, even after disfranchising half a million of voters this Government, which went to war to secure the franchise for the Outlanders, had its record Parliamentary majority of 152 reduced to 134, while in proportion to the number of votes cast on each side their majority in the House would, under a just electoral system, have been 16 only!¹

"But," say you, "the Colonies rallied to the war." Ay, so they did, thanks to the medley of lies, calumnies, and half-truths cabled out from South Africa and from Home. But in the Colonies also the process of disillusionment has well begun, and as certain as the day succeeds the night, the whole Empire will, at no very distant date, rally against the war.

"For ever the right comes uppermost,
And ever is justice done."

No; shouting with the mob may serve for the moment, but it is not by shouting with the mob that the Liberal party can best "commend itself to the highest sympathies of the country," and "secure the attention, the allegiance, and the confidence of the country"; it is by boldly standing up for the right, and by manifesting such honesty and steadfastness of purpose as will deserve, and must in the long run command, the confidence of the country. Let but the Liberal party be true to its best traditions and its highest principles, and it will not then have long to complain that the democracy is not true to the Liberal party.

The present impotence of the Liberal party is due to the fact that for years past everything has been subordinated to the endeavour to maintain that fetish yclept "party unity." Of necessity there must always be in the Army of Progress some who wish to advance quickly and some who wish to proceed slowly, and with great caution and circumspection, while at every stage of the campaign against wrong there will be found some who think that the party has gone quite far enough. For an army on the march both an advance-guard and a rearguard are necessary. But to attempt to retain in the ranks those who refuse to march any longer is fatal to all progress. The whole army is reduced to "marking time."

¹ The above figures show that, on a total poll of 5,000,000, the present Tory majority in votes is 123,000. If the Tories only held as many seats as this vote-majority entitled them to proportionately, this Tory seat-majority would be 16. As a fact it is 134.

"In 1892 Liberalism polled a majority of over 200,000, voters, and secured a majority of 40 only.

"In 1895 and 1900 Toryism polls about half as large a majority of votes (103,000 and 123,000), and gets majorities of 152 and 134!"—*Liberal Magazine*.

The only way to maintain the Party of Progress as an effective fighting force is to do as Gideon did with such success in his campaigns against the Midianites: weed out all the week-kneed and half-hearted, and keep the rank and file up to the mark by setting before the party some object well worth fighting for. Had the Liberal party fought during the past session with the same pertinacity and earnestness of purpose as the Irish party, this "strongest Government of modern times" might have been hurled from power, a Liberal Government would have taken its place, would have put an end to this fratricidal war, would have saved South Africa to the Empire, and would have been well on the way towards the realisation of that domestic policy which, as things now stand, is indeed indefinitely postponed.

In his speech at the Hotel Cecil (July 19) Mr. Asquith stated so clearly and so ably the line of action that the Liberal party ought to follow that it is difficult indeed to believe that in supporting the war in South Africa he is not "sinning against the light." Referring to conversations he had had with a number of eminent Colonial politicians and statesmen, Mr. Asquith said:

"They all say to me, 'How is it that you, the Liberal party of Great Britain, with whose social aspirations and whose legislative programme we are in complete sympathy—how is it that you have allowed your opponents to monopolise and exploit for their own party purposes the name and prestige of the Empire?' Gentlemen, if the Liberal party is to become, as I believe it can and might be made, not only the dominant political force in this country, but the acknowledged centre and fountain-head of Liberal ideas throughout the length and breadth of his Majesty's dominions, we must be firmer in our faith, or at any rate more articulate in its expression. And that I believe to be the first step that has to be taken if the Liberal party is to win its way to the predominance which it deserves. But—and here comes in the essence of Liberal doctrines—such a conception of Empire and of our relation to it will be found not to paralyse, but to stimulate, all those aspirations and efforts which we include under the general name of social reform. It is the work of statesmanship in this country to make the Empire worth living in, as well as worth dying for. In the long run every society is judged, and survives, according to the material and moral minimum which it prescribes to its members.

"What is the use of an Empire if it does not breed and maintain in the truest and fullest sense of the word an Imperial race? What is the use of talking about Empire if here at its very centre there is always to be found a mass of people stunted in education, a prey to intemperance, huddled and congested beyond the possibility of realising in any true sense either social or domestic life. Here we come to the great work in the truest sense of the term of empire-building, which the Liberal party, and which, as I believe, alone the Liberal party, is equipped to discharge."

Liberals, he maintained, had a great work to do in regard to education and temperance reform.

"And, lastly, take the question of the housing of our working classes. There, it is true, we have had a couple of homœopathic measures, both of which are absolute dead letters at this moment. But we have had also

what I hope many of you will study and reflect upon, we have had a most valuable report from the Royal Commission appointed with no such purpose—a report in which perhaps the two greatest social experts of the day, Sir George Murray and Sir Edward Hamilton, have for the first time demonstrated that you may find a new fund, a fund which will help you ultimately largely in the solution of the question in the assessment and rating of site values of land. It is from the Liberal party, and the Liberal party alone, that question can ever hope to receive effective treatment. Do not misunderstand me. I am laying down no programme. I have neither authority nor inclination to do so, but I have mentioned these topics, taking them merely by way of illustration of my general theme to establish my two cardinal propositions, which are, first of all, that the Liberal party must recognise the Empire, not only as a fact, but must welcome it as a trust, and if it happens to be any more than a vain profession of homage before an empty shrine, it must do the best in its power to make the Empire a strong and live Empire, worthy of Christian civilisation. . . . What is the sum of the whole matter? It is this. If the Liberal party is to succeed, it must appeal to sober-minded and level-headed men in all strata of humanity, and in all quarters of the King's dominions. It must first convince the people that it is a national party, to which you can safely entrust the fortunes of the Empire. And next, and not less important, that it is the Liberal party, distinguished in tradition, in principle, in spirit from those to whom it is opposed—the party which neither fears nor favours classes or interests—the party which strives everywhere and at all times to enrich the national character and intelligence, to widen the range of opportunity, and to raise the standard of life."

It were difficult, indeed, to better the above, so far as mere phrase-making goes, but the doubt will obtrude itself—is it anything more than mere phrase-making? Is the speaker absolutely and entirely sincere? How does he reconcile these fine phrases about "making the Empire worth living in" and "worthy of Christian civilisation" with his attitude in regard to the South African war? Are our proceedings in South Africa "worthy of Christian civilisation"? Has the "statesmanship" that embroiled us in this war tended to make in South Africa an Empire "worth living in"? And if Mr. Asquith is really in earnest about housing reform and the "rating of site values of land," temperance reform, and education, why this fear of laying down a programme, of pointing out how evils may be combated and reforms achieved, of giving any clear and definite pledges as regards his action in such matters?

We fear that Mr. Asquith, like too many other so-called Liberal leaders, is good as a phrase-maker and good for little else.

Answering the question, "What does Empire mean to us Liberals?" Mr. Asquith said (Hotel Cecil, July 19):

"It does not mean a syndicate for the exploration and exploitation of the races of the world. It does not mean a mere commercial partnership founded on the basis of profit and loss. It does not mean simply a mutual insurance society for the protection of its members against external attack. Its significance and its value to us are this: that with all its failures and shortcomings, with all its weak places and its black spots, it is the greatest

and the most fruitful experiment that the world has yet seen in the corporate union of free and self-governing communities."

Surely these sonorous sentences must have been declaimed with tongue in cheek. The only experiment the Empire at present typifies to the world at large is that of attempting to incorporate or engulf against their will two free and self-governing communities; and Mr. Asquith, who some months ago protested vehemently against the very idea of annexation,¹ now holds that as a result of our paper annexation of the two Republics, all the Boers in the field, from General Botha downwards, "are at this moment, *de jure* and *de facto*, his Majesty's subjects," and assures Mr. Chamberlain that he will have his support in refusing belligerent rights to the Boers!

It is quite true that to "Liberals without an adjective" the Empire does not mean "a syndicate for the exploration and exploitation of the races of the world. It does not mean a mere commercial partnership founded on the basis of profit and loss. It does not mean simply a mutual insurance society for the protection of its members against external attack." Mr. Asquith "doth protest too much"; he may protest, as Carlyle would say, "until the infinite learned tongue wears itself small in the infinite learned mouth," but he "cannot make unjust just"; he cannot get away from the truth of the matter, that this war is but a repetition on an Imperial scale of the Jameson Raid, that Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Milner in forcing on the war merely drew the chesnuts out of the fire for Cecil Rhodes, and that to "the Colossus" the Empire does mean neither more nor less than "a syndicate for the exploration and exploitation of the races of the world," that to him it does mean "a mere commercial partnership founded on the basis of profit and loss"—the profits to "the Colossus" and the losses to the Empire!—that to him "the flag of old England" is simply "the greatest commercial asset in the world," that in the words of the arch-conspirator "*we are not going to war for the amusement of royal families, as in the past, we mean practical business.*"

Mr. Rhodes' utterances remove all manner of doubt as to his conception of Empire and his view of the war. He has further assured us that in these respects he is "the embodiment of English ideas." Thank Heaven, that boast at least is false. Day by day

¹ "I dissociate myself entirely from those, if such there be, who hail this war, this deplorable, this lamentable war, as a means to an ulterior end, the subordination of the Boers and the annexation of the Dutch Republics. Such an intention has been emphatically and repeatedly repudiated by her Majesty's Government. It finds no place, so far as I know, in the programme or policy of any responsible politician in this country. To adopt it, to coquet with it, to connive at it, would be to justify a hundredfold the charges of pharisaism and hypocrisy which are being freely levelled against us at this moment by the critics—not always well informed or well disposed—of the Continental press."—Mr. Asquith at Dundee, October 2, 1899.

the number of Englishmen who denounce and repudiate such un-English ideas becomes larger, and the war becomes more and more unpopular. But the pro-war party—and of these Mr. Asquith is one of the most pronounced—can scarcely dissociate themselves from the views and opinions of the man who made the war and who still fans the flames.

Oil can as readily mix with water as the true Liberal, or the true Imperialist for that matter, with the Liberal, or the Imperialist, who supports the Rhodes-cum-Chamberlain-cum-Milner Raid. Quite rightly, Lord Rosebery, in his letter to the City Liberal Club, described the severance between the two sections as a “fundamental and incurable antagonism of principle with regard to the Empire at large and our consequent policy.” It is quite true that the “two schools of thought cannot by any conceivable compromise be reconciled,” and that this “irreconcilable division of opinion on a group of questions of the first importance cannot now be healed, or even concealed, by a party meeting.” It is true also that

“one school or the other must prevail if the Liberal party is once more to become a force. Until that time arrives it is of no use to speak of the grand old principles of the Liberal party. That is all very well for a peroration. But for practical or business purposes it is necessary to know what these principles are, as applied to the British Empire in the present condition of the world.”

But, “little Englanders,” “pro-Boers,” “traitors,” as we have been called, we of the anti-war section cannot allow that we are “blind to the developments of the world”—we are certainly not blind to the developments of cosmopolitan finance—or that our creed, universal as the eternal principles of justice upon which it is based, is “avowedly insular.” That phrase more accurately describes those whose working creed is “My country, right or wrong.” Nor can we permit to pass unchallenged Lord Rosebery’s rhetorical and question-begging declaration that the pro-war party “places as the first article of its creed the responsibilities and maintenance of our free and beneficent Empire.” “Our free, tolerant, and unaggressive Empire” used to be his phrase, but even Lord Rosebery dare scarcely, in view of our proceedings in South Africa, boast of our tolerance and our unaggressive disposition. “Free and beneficent” our Empire must be if it is to endure. It cannot be maintained on any other basis—“righteousness alone exalteth a nation”; but we of the anti-war school, remembering distressful Ireland, remembering India stricken now with the fourth famine in as many years, remembering this war forced upon the two Boer Republics in order that we may destroy their liberties and secure their goldfields for an unscrupulous gang of cosmopolitan financiers, cannot allow that our Empire is now altogether “free and beneficent.” We would stop the war and recompense its victims, we would succour India and grant Ireland

Home Rule, we would, in short, seek to secure justice in all the relations, internal and external, of the Empire. We would make the Empire truly "free and beneficent," "free, tolerant, and unaggressive," for that is the only path of safety for the Empire; and for that very reason we hold that it is sheer absurdity, if not sheer mendacity, for those who care little or nothing for Home Rule for Ireland, for those who have demanded no famine-grant for India, for those who excuse, condone, palliate, or support the war in South Africa to prate about "placing as the first article of their creed the responsibilities and maintenance of the Empire."

It is not by ignoring its faults, winking at its follies, and aiding, abetting, and applauding its crimes that the Empire can be maintained. If we would not speed the Empire on the road to ruin we must correct its faults, check its follies, and condemn its crimes. Yet, forsooth, those who take the former course arrogate to themselves the title of "patriots" and "Imperialists" and stigmatise as "insular," "little Englanders," "pro-Boers," and "traitors" those who would turn the Empire from its downward course.

Nothing is to be gained by refusing to look facts squarely in the face. Lord Rosebery and his like may "whitewash" the Empire, but that will not avail if inwardly there is nothing but rottenness and all uncleanness. The denial of Home Rule maintains a running sore in Ireland; unless steps be taken, and that right speedily, to lessen the drain of some £30,000,000 *per annum* upon India, and to put an end to the constantly recurring famines, our rule in India is doomed; and the Boer war bids fair to result in the loss of South Africa to the Empire¹

The true Imperialist—and your true Liberal is the only true Imperialist—does not blink ugly facts. An Empire sound at heart, not a whited sepulchre, is his ideal. Therefore, abuses, be they never so hoary; wrongs, be the "vested rights" in them never so strong, meet always with his most strenuous opposition, and he is ever for root-and-branch reform rather than for the tinkering palliatives which

"Will but skin and film the ulcerous place,
While rank corruption, mining all beneath,
Infects unseen."

¹ "I believe," said Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman at Pontypridd on July 12, "that a tremendous crisis arises in the policy of the country, and on that crisis the Liberal party can perfectly well be solid. By a crisis I mean that, in my judgment, it depends upon the way in which our affairs are conducted for the next—what shall I say?—six months, perhaps less; on that depends whether South Africa remains a portion of the British Empire or not. That is my strong opinion, and, therefore, it is a most serious thing, and it is not by shouting 'Rule Britannia,' it is not by waving the Union Jack, it is not by any silly thing of that sort that we are, not only to have a solid Empire in that part of the world in the future, but also to reinstate ourselves fully in the opinion of thinking men throughout the world. . . . Let us try to reinstate ourselves. Let us show how generously and how reasonably and how sensibly we can bring this dreadful matter to a conclusion."

The great need to-day, not only of the Liberal party but of the Empire, is a sound, all-round Liberalism, embracing both a sane imperialism and a sane domesticism. The two are inseparable. Our foreign policy and our domestic policy act and re-act upon one another. This Lord Rosebery recognised when in his letter to the City Liberal Club, he said :

"That there is a great Liberal force in the country, that it could effectively combine on a domestic policy, and that it is capable of indefinite extension, I am absolutely convinced. As to domestic policy, it has, indeed, a great opportunity. But, for all that, it can only become a power when it has made up its mind on Imperial questions, which are at this moment embodied in the war;"

and when in his speech to the same Club, after pointing out that the opportunities that the Government have missed in regard to Temperance reform, educational reform, reform of the House of Lords, Army reform, housing reform, old-age pensions, &c., are but the measure of the opportunities that lie before the Liberal party, he said :

"I do not despair of seeing the Liberal party purged from all anti-national elements, and, confident therefore of the support of the country in regard to Imperial and foreign questions of policy, proceeding in the work of domestic reform. They will have no difficulty with the country on these questions, provided the country feels that they are sound on the question of Empire, for the country is ripe for a domestic programme."

But Lord Rosebery then proceeds to make a bid for the support of the Liberal Unionists—an anti-national element of which the Liberal party has been well rid these fifteen years past; his Imperialism, as Mr. A. M. S. Methuen has well shown in his "Peace or War in South Africa," is of the type that lost the North American Colonies to the Empire; and what he has to say on domestic problems is vague and frothy; in short, so far as true Liberals are concerned, Lord Rosebery may be left to "plough his furrow alone." Before he gets to the end of the furrow it is possible that he may find himself not alone, but in that case he will find himself in the Tory camp, with, peradventure, Sir Edward Grey, Sir Henry Fowler, Mr. Asquith, and others close in his wake.

Mr. Asquith and Sir Edward Grey have both sought to bolster up their Imperialism by propounding a more or less advanced domestic policy, but, as pointed out above, in regard to Mr. Asquith, their utterances are lacking in definiteness, and their *bona fides* is thus left in doubt. There is over it all an air of insincerity and make-believe.

The utterances of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, both on Imperial and domestic issues, are much more straightforward and convincing, but he has sacrificed much in his attempt to maintain the unity of the party; and his efforts to save the Liberal party from any

share in the responsibility for the war have been in no small degree stultified by his voting supplies for the war, and by his acquiescing in the policy of annexation. In these, as in other matters, justice is the statesman's only safe guide, and obviously to annex the two Republics after forcing on them an unjust and unnecessary war would be but to pile injustice on injustice.

As regards domestic questions and their bearing on the Empire, Sir Henry's utterances at Peckham on August 7 last were so clear and cogent that we may be pardoned if we give a lengthy extract.

"What," said he, with his characteristically pawky humour, "are we to make of a Government which, when not engaged in feathering the nest of its own friends, is occupied in tarring and feathering, not only its opponents—we are used to that, and don't mind it—but any popular institution that has shown itself capable of a progressive spirit?" and, instancing the attacks on the London County Council and the London School Board,

"It is," he continued, "scandalous that they should be attacked and hampered and threatened with mutilation, and even with extinction. Such a course is directly opposed to the interests of London. The truth is, ladies and gentlemen, the present Government is the Government of the vested interests, and therefore they have an unkindly feeling—not unnaturally—to any institution which would subordinate themselves to the public interest. . . . Now, take for a moment the housing question. Everybody talks about it and nobody does anything. The facts are familiar to you all. Let me point out one curious thing—a curious double action with regard to housing. Overcrowding drives up rents, and high rents create overcrowding, and so you are in a vicious circle. What you have to do is to get rid of them both by encouraging building, especially municipal building, by taking larger powers for the acquisition of land, and by opening up new and cheap means of transit in and out of this huge hive of human industry. You may, ladies and gentlemen, build schools; but what is the use of it so long as your children are living in circumstances which make the lessons of civilisation a farce? You may make your Empire the greatest in the world; and what is the good of it if at the heart of your Empire fathers and mothers, with all their striving, cannot obtain for their children a foothold in a few feet of space in which they can be brought up with proper regard to self-respect? But always remember, at the root of the housing question is the land question. Does any one here believe that the present Government will deal effectively with the land question? They generally act as if they thought land and rent were two synonymous terms, and as if the agricultural interest was the same thing as the landlord interest. They are more concerned with the suffering of the landlord whose rural rent is going down than they are with the rack-rented occupant of a pair of rooms in London. Nay, they help the former at the cost of the latter. This aid to rural rent comes out of the pockets of the very people in towns who are paying in rent what they ought to have to spend upon food and clothing, and on the shopkeepers and business men, whose rates are three and four times higher than the farmer's are. What does London pay in this respect for what we call doles? London pays for England and Scotland every year £322,247; and if we add Ireland—which is on a somewhat different footing, and therefore it could not quite be added in the same way—but if we did add it it would come to £467,788.

"And all this time no relief is given—no relief given to those who are unequally rated in towns. Well, these doles to the agricultural tenant, and therefore to the landlord, were given six years ago, and now they calmly propose to give them in perpetuity. Well, ladies and gentlemen, the Government is the master of many legions, and can do pretty well what it likes in the Legislature, and therefore we were only too glad to induce them to limit the time of this grant to four years, partly because it was a limit. That of itself was something to gain, but still more because the limit of four years was an acknowledgment that within that time they were bound to deal with this question on a large scale, and to put it on a more just footing than it stands now. Well, if they are going to begin a great scheme, they have at one point at least received a good lead from some members of the Royal Commission which lately sat upon it. Let me read what these Royal Commissioners say. They report in favour of the rating of site values. They say that site and structure, which are now combined for rating purposes, differ so essentially in character that they ought to be separately rated; that when separately structure and site value were capable of bearing some heavier taxation they should be made to bear it, subject to strict respect for existing contracts; that the differential rating should take the form of a special site value rate, and then they say, 'more especially since anything that tends to relieve the pressure of local taxation, or to prevent the growth of it, must ultimately sooner or later benefit the owners of site values, it seems desirable that any increased provision made by the State in aid of services locally administered should be accompanied with some make-weight in the shape of owners' site value rate.' What is this that we find in the report—I admit, a minority report—of a Royal Commission? It is what all land reformers in and out of the London County Council have been saying for years. Now the majority on this Royal Commission say that the system established is neither equitable nor practicable. Which do you think the Government will throw over when they come to deal with the question? This minority report is the report of the Chairman of the Commission—a Cabinet Minister himself, Lord Balfour of Burleigh—and of two of the greatest Treasury experts in the public service—Sir George Murray and Sir Edward Hamilton. Will they take their report, or will they throw it over? Will they to this mild and tentative extent admit that land is made for men, and not men for land, and that the prerogatives and immunities attaching to land must give place to the welfare of mankind cooped up in great cities? But London wants more than land. It wants water; and for what reason has it not obtained that full supply of pure and good water that has been obtained elsewhere? Simply out of deference to private interests. And a third thing that London wants is to be relieved of an excessive number of public-houses. . . . What help in these three matters so vitally affecting the health and happiness of the people of London—what help do you get from the party now in power? You get the smallest modicum of help that they can give, and that reluctantly given under compulsion. And why? Because the monopolies and the privileges and the interests stand in the way! This discloses, ladies and gentlemen, the cardinal difference between the two great parties in the State. There has been a great deal said lately and written—and the chairman has referred to it—about the condition of parties, and especially of the party to which you and I have the privilege of belonging. It has been written about as if it was all a question of names and appellations and persons. No, sir, it is a question of principle. And the sooner within our party men cease to seek out names and titles for themselves, and to think of the claims and the interests of this person or that, the better, and then they can seek to apply one main principle in all domestic affairs. What is that one principle? It is that

the interest and duty of the State is to secure for every individual among us the opportunity—if you like to call it so, the chance—of a healthy, happy, and useful life; the best chance for developing the powers which God has given him. Men are not born equal. They have differences in their qualities—mental, moral, physical. We cannot equalise the chances, but we can see that our laws and habits do not aggravate inequalities. And in the pursuit of this purpose we can make, and we ought to make, the interests of individuals and the privileges of classes yield to the general interest of the people at large. Those London questions upon which I have touched are every one of them cases in point. It is by the application of this principle, ladies and gentlemen, that we should become healthy and strong as a nation, and maintain the heritage in the world which we have received from our fathers. And by these humble victories over the evils under which we are beset at home, we shall do far more for our world-possession and for our power to bear the proud burden of our responsibilities than by any amount of military glory, or by any territorial or material aggrandisement."

Here we have enunciated a sane domesticism, based on the great principle of equal rights for all. Apply that principle also to international affairs, and you have a sane imperialism springing out of and broad-based upon that sound domestic policy. They are the true patriots and they the true imperialists who demand that all the relations, both internal and external, of the Empire shall be based on right and justice, for that is the one lasting foundation. In regard to foreign policy there is no infallible test of the *bona fides* of would-be Liberal leaders. In regard to domestic policy, however, that is, those questions that concern the very foundations of the Empire, there is ready to hand an unfailing touchstone. Since, *except as regards financial reforms*, "the House of Lords blocks the way" for all Liberal measures, the one sure and certain test of the good faith of Liberal leaders is their readiness to bind themselves clearly and definitely to introduce at the first opportunity the urgent financial reforms to which the party stands pledged—the rating of site values, the taxation of land values (including mineral rents and royalties), the payment of members and of election expenses, the abolition of the breakfast-table duties, and old age pensions. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman is on the right lines, but he has not yet adequately conformed to this test. We trust that he may shortly do so, and give at the same time a powerful lead in regard to the war. "Liberals, Forward! March!!" should be the word of command. The country would, we are convinced, soon step into line with the Liberal party. Let the Liberal party but show that they are true patriots and true imperialists—let them but deserve the confidence and the allegiance of the people of this country—and they will not long have to complain that that confidence and that allegiance are withheld.

THE AGNOSTIC AGONY.

THE chief difference between pessimism and agnosticism is this : a pessimist may believe in a creed, but an agnostic has to live without the aid of any religious system or ism. A man can be a pessimist and a Christian ; he cannot be an agnostic and take comfort in any ism or religion. The moment he "believes" he ceases to be an agnostic. The danger lies in becoming fanatical with conviction and an incurable cynic with scepticism. It is a fact that an avowed sceptic is never welcome in any company of people. The reason is obvious : he can sympathise with no one's sentiments. A period of agnosticism gives some minds time to think, look about and choose ; but if the period be prolonged a sort of psychological atrophy begins to develop which often ends in a state of chronic apathy, out of which no psychic incident or influence can rouse them.

Some men boast of their ability to doubt, as others boast of their good fortune in perceiving and knowing. I have noticed that some agnostics are prone to damn the opinions and beliefs of others ; but the people who believe do less sneering and mocking. The fact is, as soon as we say we don't know we assume a negative attitude. No general could long retain command of any body of troops if he gave it out that he was in ignorance of the strength and the movements of the enemy ; it is his business to know something about the other side, for if the enemy remain invisible the greater will be the clamour to find out some fact about his strength, position, morale. The general, I say, who sits down and says he knows nothing would not long be left in command of any body of troops. His business is to send out scouts and spies to bring back some knowledge, little or great, of the other side. In the commercial world the law of knowledge rules, as it does elsewhere. The merchant who refuses to look about him and keep up with the rules of progress will soon see his business pass beyond his control. The modern thinker who refuses to probe, analyse, investigate and search out, places himself in a negative position, and he is promptly ruled out of the race of thinkers.

But there is a great change in the attitude of intelligent

agnostics; for agnostics are of two kinds—the wilfully apathetic and those who wish to learn. Certainly no man can call himself a thinker who refuses to do battle with the mysterious forces which encompass us round about, as palpable as the air we breathe. If there were no mysteries there would be no such thing as science, and if book-learning contained all practical wisdom there would be no such thing as intuition. Everything is like everything else. There is but one source; but an infinite variety of appearances. The soul of the universe is one—its manifestations are without limit in variation. Phenomena produce mystery; the whole conscious world is engaged in the unravelling of mystery. Consciously or unconsciously, every human being is engaged in the pursuit to become wiser. This is the aim and meaning of conscious existence. Without this aim there would be no meaning attached to life. I think it impossible, at the present moment, for any true man of science to deny the force and influence of anything visible or invisible. Indeed, the scientist who to-day declares that a thing is not true because he has not seen it and felt it is put down as shallow and superficial. The paradox is amusing: mystery is rendering mystery less mysterious! We have but to go to wireless telegraphy and hypnotism to see how the unscientific is controlling and dominating science, so-called. The old-fashioned scientist, who denied everything new, like the old-fashioned musician, is a being without voice or power in the world to-day. For although he may talk and write and preach no one pays him serious attention. It is the manifestation of the invisible which rivets the attention of the world now, not the denials, the subterfuges, and the explanations of the positive. The word “science” has now little of the old meaning, and a new word may have to be invented to cover the attitude, the aims and the power of the new tendency. Let the truth be said: the man who hopes and expects is far more interesting than the man who believes nothing, expects nothing. Illusion is more fascinating than disillusion. No man can have an active influence on any body of people who admits his inability to proceed farther, be it through light or through darkness. Illusions are transitory realities; in accepting them as such we are often led to the permanent. The agnostic, in getting rid of all illusion, has placed himself in a state of helplessness. He is like a man who has fasted too long—his digestive organs have come, at last, to refuse nourishment.

I believe that there are as many diseases in the mental as in the physical man. Every ism, no matter under what guise, must be classed as a mental disorder the moment we are bound up in it. The instant we cease to progress we enter upon a decline, whether it be towards intellectual stagnation or towards physical decay. But mystery, illusion, and curiosity keep the world from universal

decadence. The forces which impel men to move on and on, through maze after maze of disappointment and disillusion, are hope and egoism. One of the principal reasons for new isms is this: without new ones the old would hold us fast; we should be sitting still and enjoying the so-called revelations of our grandfathers. Every new-ism, therefore, is an effort towards greater freedom. It makes no difference what the belief is, every man who remains quiescent gives himself out as a negative quantity in the world of thought and action. The thirsty who sit down in the oasis, and remain there, are still in the desert; the world of the contented man is a speck around which the sinroom sweeps the sands of isolation and forgetfulness.

Agnosticism properly belongs to a period of scientific transition. Critical minds wait; but while they wait doubt knocks at the door, and the door is often open to scepticism. And so, without knowing it, the agnostic glides into a state of positiveness which he mistakes for truth. His mind is positive, while his senses are inactive. The agnostic attitude seemed natural and proper from 1860 to 1895. The tide turned with the conjunction of several influences in the material and psychological world a few years ago. Tyndall, Haeckel, and Huxley all did a work which had to be done. But that work was limited to chemical and biological demonstration. It was science, but science of the old school. Just as the reign of a man of genius like Goethe makes thousands of intelligent men appear like pigmies, so the revelations in the domain of light and sound, electric transmission, and mental suggestion, make the discoveries of Darwin and all his contemporaries appear trivial in comparison. The simple fact that thought can be transmitted, as well as electric currents, without wires, is enough to stupefy the conservative mind. Even now, efforts are being made to develop an independent action of mind and will outside of the body, so that while the body is sleeping or reposing in one place the mind, or double, may visit a friend or a locality, at a great distance, and return with the knowledge which it went to seek. Indeed, several schools of hypnotism claim this faculty for some of their pupils. What this means may be conjectured if we consider for a moment the possibility of a mind gifted in this way, setting to work to discover the secrets of some great chemical business or political intrigue. We are at the beginning of a cycle of invisible forces; the coming age will be one of invisible action. The submarine torpedo-boat typifies the development of the century. Life as well as destruction will be dealt out by invisible forces and invisible methods. This is pre-eminently the age of mind, as the past century was the age of matter. So far as we know, electricity is the soul of visible form. What we call brain-waves have an analogy to electric waves.

In former times intuitions were presented in systems of philosophy.

It is no exaggeration to say that the discoveries and inventions of the past ten years have made child's-play of every known system of philosophy. Never again will any man be able to build up a philosophical system which will stand the assaults of the new science for the space of a single year. No one reads philosophy now, because the simple but amazing facts disclosed during the past five years render the dreams, the speculations, and the guess-work of the past absurd. The little that we now know in a practical way is more than all the philosophers of the past knew, from Aristotle to Leibnitz. The absurdity of the old systems may be summed up in the Positivism of Auguste Comte, which aimed at hard-and-fast rules of life and conduct, as if such things could ever be in a world in its infancy. Every fresh discovery delivers a blow at the old and fixed formulas; every disclosure of mental power bids defiance to some stereotyped belief. But the most wonderful fact of the present is that we are being ruled by the seeming impossible. Some of the most successful inventors of the present day would have passed for madmen twenty years ago. The so-called dreamers are now the men of action; they are the ones we swear by; they have proved their power and competence, and thinking people turn to them for more miracles of discovery and invention.

Another striking fact is that of the subordination of mere preaching, in the realm of the intellect. Sermons no longer interest. The best men in the pulpit are now giving us discourses founded on psychological and scientific fact. Everywhere the most influential churches are dominated by the scientific spirit. They are not leading, as they did thirty years ago; they are being led. I do not know to-day, from London to San Francisco, a church which is able to attract an intelligent body of people by the old methods of proselytising. While people are tired of ethical platitudes, they are equally tired of scepticism, so prevalent twenty years ago. Scientific progress has made it impossible for thinking minds to put up with either one of these postulates. As in electrical invention the word "impossible" is no longer spoken, so in the realm of the mind the word no longer discourages the philosopher and psychologist. Doubt is fatal to the success of any work, mental or physical. Hesitancy and fear have an affinity. No one who is in doubt can attain that plane of fearlessness so necessary to progress and achievement. Hesitancy, if you but give it rope enough, will end in a tangle of fear. Every thinker who has accomplished anything excellent has begun by believing in something. First, he has confidence in himself; second, he has confidence in others; third, he feels that in the eternal mysteries there resides a law and a force which may be revealed by flashes of intuition; fourth, he knows that the world is not standing still. The greatest pessimists have felt something of all this, but the most typical agnostics have

not. For no one can wait and work at the same time. They have made the grave mistake of not seeking to disentangle themselves from the web of doubt and uncertainty; they sit still and rub their eyes at every fresh discovery, and cry out: "It may be true, but I don't know." Would it be possible for a merchant or shopkeeper to hold his business successfully while saying he knows nothing about the business methods of a formidable rival? Look where we may, it is the men who hope and work who are triumphing. And the people who are wide awake to new inventions and discoveries are the ones who do the best business and make the greatest progress. In the great struggle of the future the nation most keenly alive to intellectual and invisible force will triumph. The nations most bound up in the material will succumb. Intellect will dominate material force, no matter how formidable the material force may be. The future belongs to scientific power, applied by genius of a psychic and intuitive order. The dreamers of the future will be the ones who depend on the old-fashioned methods of scientific research. They will dream on and on in a sort of fool's paradise, placing crowns and kingdoms at the mercy of a cannon shot, and they will lose. The time is not far distant when a science of the mind will treat material science as if it were a plaything. The rulers of the future need not make themselves visible in public; their work will be done in silence and in secrecy; they will command from distant and isolated places. Material riches will play but a secondary part. Mammon will be forced under by purely intellectual pressure. Many of the self-made millionaires I have known were deeply interested in some religion or ism, out of which they expected some enlightenment and consolation. No people are more conscious of limitation than millionaires. But the day is coming when the psychic power of the intellect will kill millionairism. The two cannot exist together. There will be no battle, no strife, no cunning display of intrigue; the blows will be delivered silently, like the stroke of an electric bolt. Brute power will succumb to soul force. Now, the modern millionaire is not wholly a fool! The moment he sees that destiny is against him he will deliver his money-bags for the universal good, and be very glad to live and work in the world like other mortals. Fear and respect will at last compel him to give way to intellect.

I am not a believer in bloody revolutions. I see signs, even now, which cause me to think that millionaires are beginning to consider the question of spiritual versus material power. The money evil has grown to gigantic proportions through loss of faith in creeds and churches. Science and common sense abolished Hell; but materialism and agnosticism supplied nothing in the place of the old superstitions. With every million gained rich men grew more

selfish, more arrogant, more vulgar. There was nothing to check them here, and there was to be no punishment hereafter. And then, somehow, the *nouveaux riches* got it into their heads that modern science was all on their side. Did not Darwinism prove that the survival of the fittest was the true and natural order of human life? And what is a rich man but the survival of the fittest? The fact was so patent that every illiterate miner and railway magnate could appropriate it. It made the Jewish financiers of Europe more haughty and impertinent, and the American stock-broker more imperious and presumptuous. It was the sort of science they loved; it put into their hands a two-edged sword. It gave them a moral as well as a material law to support them in every fresh act of folly, avidity, and cunning. But the Jewish financier went to the synagogue, and the others to the different churches, without believing one word that was preached in them. At its worst, the doctrine of the survival of the fittest is a gilded lie; at its best, a ghost at a banquet. But the old scientists and the new millionaires are beginning to perceive that mind is superior to muscle, that it will eventually control and dominate the impulses and ambitions of the brute instincts in man. Up till quite recently rich men had a sort of contempt for genius, looking on it as something visionary. For what had genius to do with the buying and selling of stocks, the building of railroads, or the smelting of ore? But with the discoveries of Edison it was seen that genius would, directly or indirectly, influence the money market. It was seen that this wizard was revolutionising science. The rich began to consider the meaning of intuition and genius; they had here a force to reckon with, and, above all, a force to respect. Later came wireless telegraphy, hypnotic control, and mental inter-communication, to accomplish for the vulgar world, as well as the learned world, what the genius of Edison had left undone, and to open the eyes of all but the blind to the possibilities of the future.

It is a fact that doubt, hesitancy, scepticism, are inherently destructive, and that what affects the mind also affects the body. But the mental agony endured by some agnostics can hardly be defined in words, as I well know from personal experience. A chronic state of agnosticism not only renders a man discontented with himself, but it renders him irritable and contradictory whenever the belief of others comes up for discussion. In spite of the attitude of some writers of the present, the age of stoicism is past. A man who is indifferent can neither fill the position of thinker nor scientist. Indifference is both neutral and negative. And indifference is only make-believe when we see it turn into fury—which is half envy and half spite—against some author who dares to express something a little more hopeful and a good deal more helpful than

the humdrum of the ordinary writer. One of the secrets of M. Maeterlinck's power is the spiritual insight and hopefulness expressed in his essays. They are not denials, but the expression of an intuitive knowledge, aided by observation and experience. His attitude is one of mental progress aided by science. It requires faith, intellect, and vigour to give other people courage to live and work, with a living faith in something real, beyond the confines of the visible and the tangible.

I remember the outcry against the attitude of Robert G. Ingersoll, who at one time was in a fair way to make agnostics of the majority of thinking Americans. While the most eloquent preachers in the different churches were listened to by wealthy congregations they made no progress. The churches had plenty of substance, but no soul or spirit, and the celebrated agnostic knew it. He attacked them on their weakest side, and had it all his own way for a period of twenty years. From 1870 to 1890 he denied everything, from Judaism to Spiritism, and during this period there was no science, philosophy, or ism that could influence him.

But there came a day when Colonel Ingersoll found himself too old, too fixed in his ideas, to take any interest in the new order of things. Young men were bringing with them a new science and a new faith. The future was for the young inventors and thinkers, and Colonel Ingersoll belonged to the past and had done his work. But were he beginning his career now he would be compelled to face a whole world of electric, magnetic, and psychic problems, to deny any one of which would make him appear ridiculous. Robert Ingersoll filled a gap in the world of thought which nature intended him to fill. Everything has its own time. Phenomena come and go in cyclic order. There is nothing before or after the proper time. We know what a scientific mind means to-day, and we know what a scientific mind meant thirty years ago;¹ and the thinkers of

¹ At the receptions of Dr. John Chapman, the late Editor of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, I often heard the subject of Agnosticism discussed. I allude to a period between 1872 and 1874. Among serious people, at that time, the two thinkers most talked about were Darwin and Renan. At one of Sir Duffus and Lady Hardy's Saturday evening receptions at North Bank, Regent's Park, where I was a frequent visitor, I remember a group of writers standing in the middle of the room; they included Sir Duffus Hardy, Hepworth Dixon, Arthur O'Shaughnessy, and John Cordy Jeaffreson. They were eagerly discussing Renan's *Life of Christ*, and I could see that the impression created by that book was a profound one; indeed, it was more profound than some of them dared admit. I was an onlooker, being too young to discuss such questions, but I had my eyes and ears well open to all that was to be seen and heard. In the London of that day there were but two kinds of thinkers—the scientific agnostics and the unorthodox believers. The last included writers like Mr. and Mrs. S. C. Hall and the Rev. H. R. Haweis, all of whom I also met very often. I was a passive onlooker, as I have said, but I had an impression even then that the attitude of the learned and literary worlds was a posture of doubt and *ennui*. The things said and done had about as much soul as a piece of dried parchment belonging to a distant age. But many things which I could not account for then are quite clear now.

to-day are as far removed from the thinkers of 1870 as electricity is from steam. We know steam to be a crude and clumsy thing compared with electricity, and to-morrow we shall awake to the fact that mind is just as superior to the crude electric current. ;

FRANCIS GRIERSON.

THE "PAOLO AND FRANCESCA" TRAGEDY.

WE are required to believe, as the basis of the plot of this very beautiful work of art, that the tyrant Giovanni—not merely the hard and rough soldier of his own self-description, but, by inference from the subject-matter, a commander of experience and probably a tactician and strategist of repute; also a wide-awake ruler, if not a wily adept in the sort of subtle statecraft of his country and century—incur the risk of sending his much younger brother Paolo to escort from Ravenna to Rimini, his ancestral home, his girl-bride to be. This imprudence, owing to exigency of state affairs and the rashness of the elder brother's character, we, with some diffidence, admit within the limits of credibility and probability.

BUT a further demand is made upon our credence when we find that Giovanni has confided to his younger brother a motherless girl reared in a convent, from which she actually steps forth into the wide world for the first time in her transit from Ravenna to Rimini. But when, however, the author, piling the Pelion on the Ossa of improbability, discloses the fact that Giovanni has never even looked upon his future wife before her arrival at his castle for the wedding, credibility's patience is on the wane. And then, at last—recognising the contrast between Paolo *il bello*, the youthful and fascinating, and his brother Lo Scancio, "who has passed into the grey of life," deformed, certainly the reverse of handsome if not ill-favoured, with no magnetism nor charm of manners; in fact, not a lady's man nor the ordinary woman's ideal—our credibility is quite out of breath, and we begin to think the author to be an eccentric comedian, and, to see how much we can stand, is poking fun at us.

There is, indeed, no dire necessity shown why Giovanni, while his state is in jeopardy and his affairs in a turmoil, should pose as a middle-aged Syntax, as the man in a hurry for adventures matrimonial, rather than pursue his search for a wife in quieter times and in a more reasonable manner. He matches with the daughter of the great Polenta, who he describes in his usual cocksure way as "an indissoluble bond between us."

After this sort of action on Giovanni's part, whoever's judgment

is worth counting concerning things human will hold that what followed his wedding served him well 'right, and that contempt rather than pity, tragedy's deserved consequent, awaits the rash wrecker of his household gods. The author here, to advance his plot or to let us not escape from the damning fact that we have a prize madman to deal with, sends Giovanni off instantler, panting from the wedding to the war, leaving poor Paolo and Francesca to play at shuttlecock in his absence at their dangerous leisure, and so fall gradually into hot mischief.

But all this blundering is quite unconformable, as the geologists say, with the characterisation of Giovanni by Lucretia, "the better man," "who has ruled the fort till now," and who is certainly represented as a sensible woman. For she speaks of him as a hunchback, limp, and who, with most of his kind, likely enough to be envious, jealous, and suspicious, is specially photographed for us by her rather contemptuous reminder of "his moulded back and sullen gait": not the sort of individual to place such a trust leviathan in any one, much less in his beautiful brother Paolo, in spite of his "A something more than brothers, fiercest friends." This "fiercest friends" reminds us that the continual reiteration by Giovanni of unity of opinion and oneness of sympathy between Paolo and himself, and which Paolo upon his side seems but faintly to reciprocate, is distinctly offensive, because it is not only cloying, effeminate, and unnatural, but out of drawing. Giovanni is fatiguing and bores us; in fact, he protests too much, and so raises a suspicion of his sincerity. "For scarcely have we breathed a separate thought"; "such sympathy as ours, so close are we." "Who is indeed myself": these lines, which describe an ideal bond of fellowship and friendship and an equal understanding between a man of forty and fifty and a youth of nineteen, are inconsistent with that of "a child that put his hand in mine."

But like one of the little Indian curio boxes which fit in order beneath one another, a contradiction again pops up in the relation between Giovanni and Lucretia. This childless lady, who, if we are not mistaken, resents somewhat Giovanni's marriage, is spoken of by him as "the better man" who has "cooled a rashness," and, "since I remember, she was my friend to advise and guide with my years"; in fact, Giovanni, though cruel and vainglorious enough, seems, after all, a poor creature, who, whenever perplexed in life's scramble, runs to her to be consoled and patted on the back as her good boy, although he seemingly contrives to engineer without her assistance—all out of his own head—a most bloody revenge. Another contradiction! It comes to this, that the author cannot from either character-sketch of Giovanni obtain Giovanni's course of imprudent action as represented in his drama: neither from the envious hunchback point of view nor from Lucretia's rash, confident

one; for she was far too sensible a woman to advise such a *modo di fare*.

Mr. Stephens Phillips has now proved his hero somewhat of a madman. But, not contented with this, must needs also proclaim him a fool. And this is worked up by his favourite process, a sort of step-by-step-*à-fortiori* gradation, until we are so powerless under the staggering Ossa upon Olympus business as not even to venture to put in the smallest plea in arrest of his will to have it so. A good part of the play is consumed in trying to vaccinate this middle-aged mediæval Italian with the virus of jealousy. But it will not take! Giovanni cross-examines and bores and is bored in turn, and Paolo, Lucretia, and blind Angela try their hand, and Paolo again in the second act; and just when the experiment is going to turn out an absolute failure and every one is in despair, Lucretia, who seems to enjoy the process, drops the lancet and lets him have the brutal truth point-blank. At this announcement the sensitive creature swoons, whereas it would have taken him at least an hour at his usual rate to catch at the meaning. As it is, he prays for more time before he collapses: "Ah, *gradual* nature! Let this thought *come slow*! Accustom me by *merciful degrees* to this idea."¹ Swoons! Not he! What do you say, reader? We say, a prize monster of pachydermatous stolidity and crushing stupidity, and that neither silly Sussex nor Essex calldom could produce anything near his match!

In spite of his fine sentiments there is also a want of manliness in Giovanni, and we generally breathe an atmosphere of over-refinement, namby-pambyness, ipecacuanhic effeminacy, and make-believe. We can never quite decide whether we are dealing with real men and women, or people fresh from Hanwell, or the childishness of the nursery. Distracting our attention the whole time we were reading this play, Messrs. Postlethwaite and Maudle and Mrs. Cimabue Browne would always keep hovering in the distance.

No! This is certainly neither Shakespeare nor Sophocles, and their successor is yet to seek.

HORACE SEAL.

¹ The italics are ours. A man, strong in his faculties, on receipt of the news, would have swooned at once.

A PEACEFUL REVOLUTION.

A REVOLUTION is now in progress in Ireland; not one to occasion any alarm or anxiety to the Powers that be, yet none the less a real revolution, very much needed, and likely to achieve much good, if the intentions and objects of the promoters may be taken as guarantees of ultimate success.

A radical change in the education of the masses is a matter of great—it may be momentous—consequence; and such a change has been made, and is now in force in the system of National Education in Ireland. The object of the change may, in brief terms, be stated as an attempt to bring the system more into line with the practical concerns of life, and to foster such industrial pursuits as may best serve the country. How this is to be done, or how far it can be realised, has not yet been very fully, or, perhaps, very clearly worked out. Under circumstances even the most favourable, it must necessarily take a considerable time to afford tangible proof of the practical importance of the recent departure.

In the meantime it may not be uninteresting to review the state of primary education in Ireland for the thirty years during which period the country has almost literally groaned under that pedantic imposture known as the “results system,” or the mode of paying teachers (it was assumed) “according to the work done,” while, in reality, it shackled the instructors to the degree of powerlessness to accomplish any “result” of permanent educational value. Thirty years ago, or less, this fad—for a fad it was at the best—was in repute “in high places” all over the British Islands. I am not so sure that, at any time, it was of repute among teachers. I know, for certain, that it was opposed, by all the means at their disposal, by the National school teachers of Ireland, and was forced upon them in spite of all efforts to the contrary; and years after the hollowness of the “system” had been practically recognised by all authorities in Great Britain, the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland kept plodding—or, rather, they kept their teachers and inspectors plodding—in the old deep and miry rut scooped out for them by their predecessors in office. It is possible that the magnates of Tyrone House would have continued for another half century but for the fortunate accession of a few men of originating

power—such as Archbishop Walsh, Dr. Starkie, the late Professor Fitzgerald, F.T.C.D., and one or two others—to the board-room, within recent years.

The "results system" was abolished on April 1, 1900. The condition of the National schools was, just a month prior to this date, very forcibly put by a school manager (in the *Freeman's Journal* of February 28, 1900) in these terms:

"The system of payment by results in Ireland has been very painful in *evil results*."

In this short sentence we have at once a summary and an endorsement of the very remarkable speech of Resident Commissioner Starkie, while distributing prizes at the Glasnevin Model Farm, on Monday, February 19, 1900—a speech almost sufficient to make the bones of some of his predecessors turn in the grave. No more drastic, and no more justifiable criticism was ever indulged in by the head of a public department in reference to the work of his board. As an instance of appalling incompetence or mismanagement, he cites the case of the model farms, their failure and final abandonment, "at a loss to the State of more than £100,000!" What a damaging admission on the part of a board entrusted to control the education and mould the career of the rising millions! All this took place, however, before Dr. Starkie's appointment to the position he now holds.

From the history of the agricultural schools, the Resident Commissioner proceeds to discuss the general state of education as the outcome of seventy years' muddling experiment on the part of the educational quacks privileged to sit, high-enthroned, in Tyrone House, fruitful only in schemes and fads calculated to shackle rather than encourage the conductors and teachers of the National schools. But we let Dr. Starkie give his views in his own words:

"The cause is not far to seek why the National system has not had the full measure of success which its friends would desire for it. From the first, *its besetting sin has been centralisation*. From the centre in Dublin, the National board, disregarding all differences of race and creed and local prejudices, has imposed upon all parts of the country a rigid programme, *perhaps* ideally satisfactory, but, in many cases, ludicrously ill-adapted to the needs of the backward districts of Ireland, and to the capacities of the pupils. . . . Such an attempt was unsound, both philosophically and practically. . . . To this unhappy blunder may be attributed the want of initiative and distaste of knowledge, which so hamper the industrial development of Ireland—qualities so alien to the quick sympathies and alert intelligence which are the most salient characteristics of our race. The same excessive centralisation produced, some twenty years ago [*almost thirty years ago*] 'that elaborate mosaic of sixpences and shillings' known as the *results system*, which made half a million of children the drudges of the teachers, the teachers the drudges of the inspectors, and the inspectors of the Office."

And he might have added, as Archbishop Walsh, another commissioner, has since done, that the system made the central authorities the drudges and bondmen of the Treasury.

"I do not deny," Dr. Starkie continues, "that at its inception the system produced some of the good claimed for it by its friends. Education in Ireland was in a parlous state thirty years ago, and the new scheme, by systematising knowledge, supplied a definite aim and stimulus that were sadly needed. *But the mechanical character of the test was fatal to its utility.* The subjects of the programme were prescribed from outside, and *the iron limitations imposed by the Office allowed little play for the individual bent of the teacher or for the varied tastes of the pupils.* The excellence produced by the spur of examination was but fleeting, and *the rigidity of the programme unavoidably resulted in that monotony and uniformity of training which has paralysed the intellects of a whole generation.*"

No less emphatic is Archbishop Walsh in condemnation of "that deadly incubus known as the 'results system.'" In the course of an interview with a *Freeman* representative on February 28, 1900, his Grace said:

"According to all accounts, it had a marvellously beneficial effect when it was introduced: it was the means, in thousands of cases, of getting for the pupils something like value for their money. But its day is past. As a system it does, I must say, nothing but harm now. In thousands of our National schools it is simply trampling out whatever vestige of educational life is still to be found in them."

Evidently the archbishop has his doubts as to former accounts of "the marvellously beneficial effects" of the system. I would say that the weak point in Resident Commissioner Starkie's admirable address is that in which he almost admits that the now-abandoned scheme was a necessary remedy when introduced in the early seventies. Dr. Starkie cannot speak of that period from any experience of his own. Since 1870 the teachers' incomes have been substantially (though by no means adequately) improved by additions to "class salary," as well as by "contingent" grants. Prior to that time the condition of the teachers was wretched beyond belief. The present Head Inspector Eardley—he was appointed District Inspector in 1863—says, in one of his earlier reports, that the majority of the teachers in his school district were "working for less than the wages of a ditcher!" As an instance, for which I can vouch: I was myself appointed, in the year 1864, to the charge of a small National school three miles from Banbridge, at a yearly salary of £18, with barely £6 additional from school pence, and not a stiver from any other source! And there were "salaries" as low as fifteen pounds a year at the same time. The highest, or "first of first" salary, was £52; and to this "pound-a-week" remuneration only about 2 per cent. of the teachers in ordinary National schools were admitted. The teachers, at any rate, were in a "parlous condition" then; and if, in many schools, the proficiency was low,

the explanation is easily found. What was really wanted was a scale of salaries such as would induce men of ability and tact to make teaching the business of their lives, with less interference and trammelling from the fads and megrims of officials at headquarters. There have appeared of late some expressions of regret, from parties whose opinions are to be treated with respect, that the system as established over a quarter of a century has been abolished. The testimony in its favour is the old one of *post hoc propter hoc*. There is observable in many places a marked improvement in school-management since the time when that "stimulus" was unknown. The greatly improved position of the teachers will amply account for so satisfactory a change, and the *result* would doubtless be much more satisfactory had the better-trained teachers of more recent days been less the slaves of official visitors, as so graphically described by Dr. Starkie in the extract given above.

The change that has come about in the views of the Great Council of National Education in Ireland within the last few years is almost startling—almost incredible—coming from a body which had, for considerably over three-score years, maintained a sort of Oriental stagnation, and something more than Oriental contempt for the wants and wishes of the nation at large. It is therefore interesting at the present time to compare the pronouncements of Resident Commissioner Starkie and Archbishop Walsh with the published report of an address by a former chief of Tyrone House, the late Sir Patrick Keenan, who as Resident Commissioner ruled National education from 1871 till his death in 1891.

On October 5, 1881, while the Social Science Congress was in session in the Irish capital, Sir Patrick Keenan, then Resident Commissioner of National Education, delivered an address in the Front Hall of Trinity College, Dublin, which was fully reported in the *Freeman's Journal* (and, I presume, in other Dublin papers) of the following day, October 6, 1881. The paper was a remarkably able one, in which was traced with a master hand "the dark episodes of Irish education in bygone centuries" from the days of Henry VIII. down to the year 1831; this all by way of preface, for the main purpose of the lecturer evidently was to enlighten the *savants* of Great Britain and Ireland on the subject of National education in Ireland as worked under the lecturer's control. That the assembled representatives stood much in need of some enlightenment on the subject appears to me pretty clear from the circumstance that, on the occasion, the speaking was left entirely to members of the Board of National Education. The chair was occupied by Lord O'Hagan, a Commissioner of National Education. The thanks of the meeting to Sir Patrick were moved by the Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, the Rev. Dr. Jellett, a Commissioner of National Education. The vote was seconded by Mr. J. W. Murland, another Commissioner of

National Education. No one else appears to have put in a word for or against the Provost's motion. Clearly the Social Science philosophers thought it was safer to leave so abstruse a subject as primary education in Ireland to be dealt with by those who ought to know something about it, to wit, the members of the Tyrone House Board. And the said members did accordingly resolve themselves into a little "mutual admiration society" for the entertainment and benefit of their visitors.

The address was simply beyond the ken of any one present, save the lecturer himself. He had made the subject entirely his own; and his nominal colleagues of the board-room were as submissive and docile pupils at his feet in the lecture-hall of Trinity College, Dublin, as they were in the sanctum of the Education Office, Marlborough Street, Dublin. He had, therefore, a rare opportunity of airing his great hobby, "payment by results." Apart from this, his *resumé* of the history of primary education in Ireland is admirable. The following extract will serve to show how slender was the support which National school teachers received during the earlier decades of the system, founded in 1831 by Mr. Secretary Stanley (afterwards Earl of Derby).

"Government originally contemplated awarding only gratuities to teachers. The *bulk* of the teachers' support was to come from the pupils and the patrons of the schools. For the first seven years the Commissioners pursued the course of granting a uniform sum of £10 a year to masters and £8 a year to mistresses. In 1839 the teachers were divided into *three* classes, and paid *salaries ranging from £10 to £20 a year*! From time to time the salaries were increased. At present (1881) the salaries range from £35 to £70 a year for masters, and from £27 to £58 a year for mistresses, together with results, amounting to about a third of the class-salaries. . . . About four-fifths of the teachers' incomes are derived from Parliamentary sources. . . . In 1875 an Act was passed authorising Boards of Guardians to contribute from rates one-third of the result-fees. If all unions had become contributory, the total amount [in aid of the teachers' incomes] would have been £60,000. But of the 163 unions into which Ireland is divided, only seventy-one have, even temporarily, become 'contributory,' and at the present moment there are only sixteen unions in that category. . . . The Pension Scheme (1879) is based upon an insurance, the teacher contributing only a *fourth* part of the annual premium. The remaining three-fourths are provided from a sum of £1,300,000 of the Irish Church surplus, appropriated for the purpose under the Act."

An "episode" touched upon by Sir Patrick in the course of his address, though not directly connected with our present purpose, has an interest of its own. From the beginning, it was the practice of the Board to supply requisites to schools at greatly reduced prices. Most of the school-books were published by the Commissioners.

"In 1849 the leading booksellers of London, represented by Longman and Co. and John Murray, in a letter to the Prime Minister, protested against what they designated 'a Government manufactory of school-books in Ireland'; showing that a *fourth part of the school-books supplied*

to English schools in connection with the Committee of Council on Education came from the depository of the Commissioners in Dublin. . . . The upshot was that the Commissioners limited the sale to pupils of their own schools."

Then comes that portion of the address which proves so strange in the light of further experience; the early history of the fad so dear to the lecturer's own heart, the fad which in spite of all the self-glorification of that day's proceedings in the "Front Hall of Trinity College, Dublin," has proved itself the fruitful source of failure and worse; in short, about the least fortunate outcome of misdirected genius or self-sufficient vanity. The gushing adulation which Sir Patrick and his "backers" poured on that bubble of their own—rather, *his* own—blowing, reminds one but too forcibly of the old saying about self-praise:

"The function of educationists," said Sir Patrick Keenan, "is to discover methods of instruction; the function of Governments is to discover tests of efficiency. In respect of the latter function, THE GREAT DISCOVERY OF MODERN TIMES IS THE SYSTEM OF PAYMENT FOR ASCERTAINED RESULTS."

Oh, tell it not now in Tyrone House!

"When advocating the establishment of parish schools, Adam Smith spoke of 'the master' as 'being partly, but not wholly, paid by the public, because if he was wholly or principally paid by it he would soon learn to neglect his business.' The Irish master is principally paid by the public . . . but the application of the system of *payment for results* is a *safeguard*, even more telling than that contemplated by Adam Smith, against any possible neglect of business."

Ah, yes; the economists were all in favour of Sir Patrick's pet scheme, but the experience of less than a score of years was sufficient to put them all to the rout.

" . . . The class-salary is fixed and certain; the bonus is apportioned to the *ascertained* results."

Not the real results at all; only such portion as may be "ascertained," remember!

"In the working of this compound plan, which had its origin in a scheme of education devised for Trinidad in 1869 "

devised and worked out entirely by Sir Patrick Keenan,

"it is found that, on the average, two-thirds of the teachers' income from the Board constitute the 'class-salary,' the remaining third being derived from results. It would be more than human to expect that teachers, or, indeed, any class of persons, would take kindly to a system of tests which makes even a portion of their income contingent upon the fulfilment of conditions which to some extent are precarious and, to a larger extent, dependent upon incessant hard work."

A hard knock, this, at the action of the Teachers' Organisation in

opposing the introduction of the Trinidad scheme! But which side has proved to be in the right?

"On the other hand, I can unreservedly state that of hundreds upon hundreds of managers of schools who have conferred with me upon the scheme, I have met *only one* who disapproved of it. More than once the Roman Catholic bishops, who represent the managers of four-fifths of all the schools, unanimously expressed the highest commendation of the scheme."

We happen to know what some of them think of it now.

The picture drawn in 1881 by the author of the system was well calculated to induce the Social Science visitors to believe that Ireland had even then entered upon the enjoyment of an educational millennium.

"It has been in operation only nine years. In that period the average attendance has increased 32 per cent."

Strange that, a few years later on, it was considered advisable to introduce the principle of compulsory attendance!

"The local emoluments of the teachers have increased 119 per cent."

How little those infatuated teachers understood their own interests! Yet local emoluments have practically vanished for several years past.

"The percentage of children in the higher classes before the result period never quite reached 8; last year it had reached 24."

But, in the meantime, the classes, or "standards," have been re-cast and re-distributed to suit, if possible, the new programme. The comparison is based upon very different "units."

"The centesimal proportion of the proficient to the total number examined in each branch is the highest indication of the merits of a school. Selecting the published educational returns of 1870 (before the system of results had been decided upon), and comparing them with those of 1880 (when the system was in full operation), I find the following remarkable contrasts:

Year.	Reading.	Writing.	Arithmetic.	Spelling and Dictation.	Grammar.	Geo- graphy.
1870	... 70.5	... 57.7	... 54.4	... 61	... 31.5	... 44.5
1880	... 91.4	... 93.8	... 74.8	... 80.6	... 59.8	... 58.6

Highly satisfactory, ain't it? More plausible than real, owing to the re-casting and modifications previously alluded to.

"As regards the three essential subjects," the lecturer proceeds, "these percentages for 1880 compare favourably with the English returns:

Subject.	England.	Ireland.
Reading	88.2	91.4
Writing	80.4	93.8
Arithmetic	74.9	74.8

Rather flattering to the Green Isle! But here also the question of "units of comparison" may arise.

"But it is not by figures alone, even such figures as these, that the fruits of that system of tests by individual results can be satisfactorily gauged. These fruits are manifested in a revival of educational enterprise, in more earnest management, more skilful organisation, and more rational methods.

Yes; people have come to understand that the "figures" are simply a delusion. Evidence more weighty has since accumulated, with the "result" that the Trinidad scheme has been permitted to go the way of all over-puffed frauds.

The address was at the time a triumphant success, and the immediate effect must have been altogether satisfactory to the lecturer, his friends and admirers. The *Freeman* reporter says:

"The delivery of the address was frequently interrupted by manifestations of approval, and at the conclusion the applause was loud and hearty. Lord O'Hagan, in putting the vote of thanks (which was moved by the Provost and seconded by Mr. J. W. Murland), said his friend Sir Patrick Keenan was eminently entitled to speak upon the important subject which engaged their attention."

It scarcely required Sir Patrick Keenan's abilities and fascinating manner to give an air of plausibility "to the great discovery of the age"; for, even at a somewhat later period, the notion was still prevalent among those who knew little of actual life in the school-room, that "payment by results" was as sound in principle as "piece payment" in the mechanical arts. What could be more reasonable than that a man should be paid according to his work? who but the idle and incompetent would object to so equitable a measure of desert? So men in high places reasoned. And many thought the "argument" unanswerable. But the number was slowly increasing of those who began to suspect, if not very clearly to perceive, that the work of the teacher was not so closely analogous to the work of the bricklayer. Between the actual performance and the *ascertained* results of the latter there could be no difference, whereas in the case of the teacher's services there was no certain test or measure akin to the tape-line or the weighing-machine. Yet the advocates of results were wont to speak and write as if their pet "scheme of tests" were as automatic and as reliable as the gas-meter. The Associated Teachers were at the very beginning able to point out the absurdity of the matter. They were told that they had only to work in order to win—that it was their own fault if they were not well paid. The "great discovery," as a start-point, ignored the teacher's sense of duty, and built all its hopes on the sordid side of his vocation. The notion of the "economists" and "educationists" was that teachers and pupils ought to be kept "on the rack of exertion," and that by the judicious turning of the screw at headquarters "the standard" could be raised indefinitely. Work, so called—worry—worthless

results; these were the fruits; and of these there was an abundance. The teacher's success came to depend much more on the toughness of his lungs than on any quality of heart or head. There was a certain routine marked out for him, and his duty was to take his pupils at equal pace round the horse-mill track with no more option, no more power of initiation than the animal between the shafts. The pupils were thrown helpless upon him, and self-reliance on their part was a thing altogether foreign to the grand ideal of results.

I have met with nothing which, to my mind, so graphically and truthfully describes the school work under the operation of the Irish version of the Trinidad scheme, as the lines "from an old play" which Scott prefixes to the eleventh chapter of *The Monastery*:

"You call this education, do you not?
 Why 'tis the forced march of a herd of bullocks
 Before a shouting drover. The glad van
 Move at ease, and pause a while to snatch
 A passing morsel from the dewy greensward;
 While all the blows, the oaths, the indignation
 Fall on the croupe of the ill-fated laggard
 That cripples in the rear."

Leaving out "the oaths," we find here a living picture of the school as worked from "Trinidad," well, from Tyrone House, in the heyday of "results." The inspectors' reports have, within the past few years, gone dead against the continuance of the system once so lauded by officials—that is, while the author of the system was at the head of affairs in Marlborough Street. To say anything *then* against the merits of "results" would not improve one's position on the promotion list. And the teacher who presumed to depart from the lines marked out for him would hear of something not exactly to his advantage. We have seen that Sir Patrick Keenan's professions of confidence in the power of his scheme to effect good were of the most unqualified type; nor is there any reason to think he lost faith in the measure to the very day of his rather sudden death in November 1894. In fact, his attachment to that unfortunate "discovery" was almost fanatical. In 1868 Mr. Keenan (as he then was) submitted to the Powis Commission of Inquiry into the State of Primary Education in Ireland, a scheme for the amelioration of the condition of the teachers, in which he recommended the following scale of "class" salaries:

Class.	Salary.
I.	£20 a year.
II.	15 "
III.	10 "

To be supplemented by *two* sets of results allowance; to wit (a) Managers' Quarterly Results fees, and (b) Inspectors' Annual Results fees. In all the British dominions it does not appear that any

one ever, either directly or indirectly, favoured this complex absurdity of a scheme. Naturally enough, the same gentleman was opposed to any addition to the teachers' fixed salaries, especially those of higher grade. On one occasion when a deputation of "first-class" teachers waited upon him at the Education Office to urge the advisability of adding a portion of the supplemental grant from Parliament to the class-salaries, Sir Patrick, raising his hands heavenward, said: "Never—never will you see one *drachma* added to your fixed salaries."

In spite of all this—and it was no ordinary triumph on the part of the Associated Teachers—the class-salaries were increased not many months later on. The National Teachers' Organisation had gained the support of public men of every section and shade. On March 5, 1875, in reply to Major O'Reilly, M.P., Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, said in the House of Commons:

"In spite of all that could be said in favour of payment by results and the improvement it effected in education, we must not forget that in a country like Ireland, with so scattered a population and such small schools, payment by results would not always meet the difficulties of the case; and if teachers were left to run the risk of an epidemic, wet weather, of hostility from parents, or from those who influenced parents, you deprive the teacher of no small part of the income you wished him to earn."

There was no mention of this in the brilliant address to the Social Science Congress on October 5, 1881. The teachers had not in vain urged the terribly harassing uncertainties to which the Tyrone House scheme would subject them; and instead of having the principal share of their remuneration dependent on the fickle fortune of ascertained "results," only about a third was left at the mercy of chance, and "the Office"—quite enough, as the sequel showed.

The stock theme with the advocates from the beginning was *the interests of the pupils*. Schemes of education, it was plausibly urged, are designed not so much in the interests of the teachers as of the pupils. It was urged in reply that a measure which added needlessly to the worry and anxieties of the instructors could never prove of real advantage to the instructed. The very parties who a dozen years ago would have pooh-poohed this contention are now loudest in urging it themselves. The "system" which was to work such wonders for the rising generation stands accused and convicted of working only ruin where it ought to have produced only good. There was no more strenuous advocate of "results"—as the files of Belfast papers, especially the *Northern Whig*, say, for the year 1875, will show—than the late Mr. Vere Foster. Yet one of the last statements he made in public was an unreserved admission of the failure of the results system to improve the educational status of the National schools in Ireland.

The case was not one of simple failure. Whatever good was

accomplished could all have been realised without such worry and slave-driving. The grand aim necessarily became "the marks" and the fees depending on the marks; and these gained, the pupils were of no further account. Whether the "grinding" would ultimately serve *them* or not, was neither here nor there. The attainments, so dreadfully *bookish*, served the purposes of the examination and *that* over, they, for the most part, very soon came to an end. There was driving, and grinding, and pounding; but *education*, in the true sense of the term, there was not, and could not be: the teacher's duty was made—yes, compulsorily made—as routine, as mechanical, and almost as exhausting as the labour of galley-slaves, or rather of convicts on the treadmill. The Most Rev. Dr. O'Dwyer, Bishop of Limerick, made some telling remarks on the subject in a short speech delivered on December 20, 1900. In the course of his remarks, the bishop said:

"He did not believe in education by examination. He did not believe that after-generations in any grade of education in Ireland, primary, secondary, or higher, would show one bit of advance made. He *did* believe that the movement would be backward, as the result of all this examination system that was going on. In the first place, no centralised system of education was natural. If they kept a body of ~~men~~ in Dublin, let them be as clever, as well educated as they liked, it would be inevitable that a system that they devised for all Ireland would be a cast-iron one, that would *corrupt and restrain the natural exercise of the intellect* of the people that were subject to it. In the next place, he believed that the payment for education by results was evidently a false system. . . . If they paid for French at so much the yard, English at so much the pound, and science at so much the parcel, they would be degrading education. Some of them who had thought the thing over and over again for years, have had to stand hopelessly by, and see, as he believed, *the whole intellect of the country being crippled and reduced by an utterly false and untrue system.*"

Referring to the recent radical changes ordered by the Board of National Education, the bishop said:

"He entirely sympathised with the general scope of the changes that were being introduced. He thought that hitherto National education was too literary, and too little for the manual and practical training of the people, and one of the results of that was to foster the absurd prejudice that existed in Ireland, and almost exclusively in Ireland, against honest manual labour. A clerk in the city of Limerick, earning ten or twelve shillings a week, would start down George Street with a cigarette in his mouth, despising the honest tradesman who was earning £2 a week. There were a lot of people in the country who would almost rather go to the workhouse than earn their bread by honest labour. That was the state of things that left Ireland as it is."

And for that state of things we are very largely, if not wholly, indebted to "the great discovery of the age" once so landed and applauded. Under the blighting influence of "systems" of education forced upon the country, and wire-pulled from a single centre, the notion has grown up that it is altogether beneath an "educated" person—altogether discreditable—to earn anything by the use of

his hands; that it is more honourable to lead a life of genteel penury than to follow the pursuit of skilled labour or of any kind of handicraft whereby more comfort with more independence could be realised.

The Commissioners of National Education have at last made a laudable attempt to remedy the lamentable state of things depicted by Archbishop Walsh, Bishop O'Dwyer, and Resident Commissioner Starkie. Convinced that there was no way of mending the "results" system, save by ending it, the Commissioners decided on departing from the futile practice of "patching and darning," and have gone straight for thorough overhauling; and have been authorised by special Act of Parliament to institute such radical reforms as may to them seem necessary or advisable. To lift so great and so complicated a mass of machinery out of the ruts worn deep by seventy-years muddling and obsequious fawning on the part of officials is an undertaking of no ordinary magnitude. It is in some respects more difficult than to project and bring into healthy action an entirely new order of things: in the present case new work and new ways of working must be entered upon by hands unused to what is to be done now, and by machinery designed for very different purposes, and which cannot be got rid of or replaced for a considerable time to come. The great difficulty will be to bring in the new era without imperilling its success by throwing all things into confusion at the beginning. On this important aspect of the case Dr. O'Dwyer makes some cogent remarks:

"While he entirely sympathised with the general drift of the changes that are being made, he would ask the Commissioners of National Education to go slowly, and not to make a *sud lon* revolution over the country. If they tried to make the whole educational system of the country turn a somersault at once, the consequences were very likely to be unpleasant for the whole system. If they added a little manual instruction and a little elementary science, and see how that worked, they would gradually bring teachers to understand the new work, and they would habituate parents and children to the new programme, and so the change would be a growth, and not, as he ventured to call it, a revolution."

A revolution indeed there is when the country has been freed from "the deadly incubus of the results system." What the bishop wisely insists on is that the transition from an almost purely literary course to one of more industrial character should not be violent or abrupt. The essentials of a good elementary course are essentials still. The leading idea of the reform is, that time heretofore devoted to the dreary, weary grinding *for evanescent results* should be turned to account in the way of developing tastes and capacities for further technical training. It is no more than the adoption in Ireland of what has been already adopted in England, of what has indeed done so much for the industrial superiority of the Continent and America; and it is everywhere admitted that no civilised land stands more in need of such reforms than poor Ireland.

"To show by one satiric touch—
No nation ever needed it so much."

It will take a considerable time to make the improvement felt or even appreciated. The parents and guardians of children cannot at once "see the good of the thing." In a few localities there have been some manifestations against school-drill, which is part of the new programme: the poor people fancying that the children are drilled so that Government may, by-and-by, press them into military service. The elementary practices of paper-folding, brick-building, and other exercises in connection with hand and eye training can easily enough be ridiculed by those who "can see no good in such things." From these and similar sources of dissatisfaction on the part of parents some trouble has here and there arisen. But these are troubles which will pass when the real object of recent changes comes to be better known among those whom they most concern.

The new departure has created much uneasiness—something, indeed, very little short of panic—among the teachers. The new programme as put into their hands supposes duties for which few, if any, appointed before the change have received any training; and if the provisions in their entirety were to be at once carried out, it would involve the untimely resignation of many who, too old perhaps to learn new ways, are yet too young to qualify for such pension as would afford maintenance—even the slenderest. A monstrous injustice it would be towards men and women who have devoted the best of their lives to the carrying out of measures forced upon them in the first instance, but, by long usage, became, as it were, part and parcel of themselves. But I think we may take it as tolerably certain that the Commissioners will not run the risk of shattering the new project by pressing it to any unreasonable extent. Indeed we have had more than one public assurance from the Commissioner to whom, I believe, the recent reforms are mainly due—the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh—that the position of the teachers will not be made worse under the new regulations. Indeed, it is with the inspectors in whose hands the official superintendence has been placed, very much as it is with the teachers. The work is new to inspectors and to teachers alike. If a difference may be noted, the inspectors are even less fitted for the duties that now devolve upon them. It has long been a subject of complaint that the conditions on which inspectors of the National schools are appointed, whether so designed or not, practically exclude teachers from attaining to the position, which has for years been filled up from the more distinguished university graduates, brilliant students who in most cases make their first acquaintance with the National schools and the system of instruction pursued therein, after they have gained appointment on success at one of the most severe examinations held under the Civil Service Commissioners.

The very state of things which made the recent departure a

matter of extreme urgency has made departure as difficult as it was unavoidable. The whole business had become so much the slave to routine that, as already intimated, it has become deep sunk in ruts, none the cleanest, of its own making, and the labour of rescue will not all be accomplished perhaps in the lifetime of generous-hearted pioneers who have, in the face of many discouragements, put their shoulder to the wheel in the real earnest that warrants ultimate success.

The period of pulling down and reconstruction is hardly a favourable time to judge of the merit or effect of the finished design. But, as will be seen from the evidence I have adduced, the ball had come so low on the wheel that a move in any direction must needs be an upward one. That the present *is* an upward move is, I believe, very generally admitted. To the coming generation of teachers it will, I have no doubt, prove more acceptable than to those now engaged, the older members at any rate. Heretofore it was as high treason for a National school teacher to assume initiative, however much required among his constituents. In future he will be allowed a freer hand, and will find that in his calling tact and taste will be accorded the place which formerly were monopolised by unvaried mechanical drudgery and cast-iron programmes. He will be relieved from the wearing labour of spending years in poring over, again and again, the dreary course in which it was necessary to pass examination after examination before he could rise to the position of first or even second class. It may seem incredible—but I, for one, am witness to the fact—that at the time when the highest income derived from the State was £52 a year, there were as many as *eight* grades or ranks, and to pass from one to the next higher rank, the candidate, in addition to satisfactory service in the school-room, had to pass a severe written examination, and (if successful at this) a subsequent *oral* examination *on the same subjects* before a board of inspectors. It often happened that a candidate got creditably through the written tests, and failed to gain promotion owing to an unfavourable return from the *viva voce* examiners. I have a vivid recollection of one such case. At the first “oral” to which I was called, there was present a man of considerably over fifty years. He was in the lowest “grade” of first class—the first “class” was split into *three grades* at the time; he had passed the written examination, and believed he was in a fair way to promotion to “second of first.” The chief examiner, the head inspector, was a savage; for in those days the relations between inspectors and teachers were as those between bashaws or mandarins and simple bondmen. There were over a dozen candidates sitting around the inspectors’ table, all young fellows, at their first examination, with the exception of the man who was going for a higher grade. Yet he was put to the question among the rest. Although a man of creditable attainments, he did not evince the same readiness in oral answering as some of

his younger less informed and less-experienced brethren. Sometimes he would mistake the question, and answer wide of the mark. "Oh, such an answer from an old veteran!" the head inspector would exclaim in a loud, sarcastic voice. The poor old fellow bore it all with the meekness of a martyr. Nor was this all he had to bear. He got no promotion that year; and had to begin poring over the dreary text-books as before, in preparation for "written" and "oral" the following year, if he desired further promotion. The "oral" examination was subsequently abolished, and the number of "grades" lessened, but in spite of these concessions and the adoption, to a limited extent, of "optional" subjects, the examinations excluded all but a few able and studious teachers from attaining to the higher classification—in many cases excluded from promotion men of first-rate worth in the school-room. It is a matter on which I may venture an opinion, and I have not the least hesitation in saying that there are hundreds of university graduates who never could have attained to "first of first" under the Board of National Education in Ireland, perhaps never to any grade of first class. The programme was extensive and varied, the questions were difficult, and fifty per cent. the usual minimum of "pass."

There is certainly a great "incubus" taken off the teachers when they are to be relieved from the vexatious worry of having to face the fiery ordeal of examination again and again after they have been certified competent to take charge of a National school. The final examination of the training college will entitle the successful candidate to a certificate of qualification; and his promotion will be determined by length and fidelity of service. I should say that this puts promotion on a more rational basis.

There was at one time an attempt made to recognise length of service as a qualification for improved remuneration; but the thing seemed too good in the eyes of the wiseacres and pedants who then controlled National Education in Ireland. The "good service" pay was a supplement to ordinary salary, awarded to a limited number of teachers after eight-years service, and was increased at twelve and again at seventeen years. These grants required only to be made generally accessible to achieve any good there was in "the great discovery of the age"; while leaving the teacher very much to the exercise of his own discretion, they furnished motive for the right kind of exertion. The "Trinidad" wave swept away all these; it was contended payment by results would cover every kind of good service.

Yes; results "covered" good service very much as the avalanche or the lava-stream covers the fruitful valley.

THOMAS FITZPATRICK, LL.D.

[The foregoing was written before the resignation of Archbishop Walsh as Commissioner of National Education in Ireland.]

THE ABORIGINAL NATIVES OF NORTH-WEST WESTERN AUSTRALIA AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

ST. GREGORY THE GREAT is reported to have said : " If a scandal be caused by the utterance of the truth, better the creation of the scandal than the suppression of the truth." Of this saying I was forcibly reminded, on reading the articles entitled " Worse than Slavery," that appeared in the *St. James's Gazette* in March 1899.

On the 30th of the same month, I contributed a letter to that journal containing observations based upon my personal experience of the mal-administration of justice with regard to the aboriginal natives in the far North-West of the colony of Western Australia.

My letter was dealt with by two local colonial journals. One, the *Coolgardie Miner*, of April 5, stated that, " Mr. Slaughter's remarks concerning the administration of justice to the native, although strong, were not incorrect"; while the *West Australian Journal*, of April 7, stated : " Mr. Slaughter proceeds to characterise the administration of justice, as regards the Chinaman, Japanese, and aboriginal natives as a horrible farce. All will be anxious to see Mr. Slaughter's proofs of this; but it is impossible to avoid saying, that if the counsel to the late Aborigines Protection Board had been aware of this horrible farce, and has kept silence for all this time, his evidence comes with a certain amount of cloud surrounding it."

The statement regarding my silence is incorrect, for, as will be mentioned hereafter, I have repeatedly called the attention of the authorities to this matter, and the object of this essay is to draw attention towards the administration of justice to the aboriginal natives in the far North-West districts of Western Australia. With this end in view, I shall proceed to give a brief account of my personal experiences in the colony, together with the convictions I arrived at, through conducting the defence of several aboriginal native prisoners on behalf of the late Aborigines Protection Board of Perth, Western Australia.

At the outset it must be said that it is very difficult indeed for English people to comprehend the exact situation in the discussion

of this aboriginal native question: firstly, without observing the exact location of the far northern territory of Western Australia; and secondly, without being familiar with the social and political conditions of the colony.

As regards *location*, reference to a map of the colony will show that the North-West northern territory is divided into four districts; Kimberley, Pilbarra, Gascoigne, and Ashburton, with five principal townships: Wyndham, Derby, Broome, Onslow, and Roeburne. These townships, which are from 1000 to 3000 miles distant from the capital, are the strongholds and centres of officialism in the far North-West portion of the colony.

In respect of the second point, *jurisdiction*, it must be admitted that to deal adequately with the social and political conditions of the colony would far exceed present limits. Suffice it therefore to say that on October 21, 1890, the colony received a qualified grant of responsible government—the reservation being, that all matters concerning the welfare of the aboriginal natives should be under the jurisdiction of a body of persons in Perth, called the Aborigines Protection Board.

During the six years prior to its abolition, the existence of this Board was the *bête noire* of the members of the Colonial Parliament. It was banned in season and out of season, as though it had been an institution of devilry, sent straight from the bottomless pit, and the one battle-cry throughout that period was, "*Carthago delenda est!*"

After numerous unsuccessful attempts on the part of the Colonial Parliament to get the Aborigines Board abolished, its abolition was approved of by the present Secretary of State for the Colonies, in the latter part of 1897. Thus disappeared the *ancien régime*.

In May 1898, an aboriginal department, responsible to the Colonial Parliament, was formed at Perth—and this is the *nunc stans* in the matter of administration of affairs for the protection and welfare of the aboriginal native, so far as the political aspect of the subject is concerned.

I now pass to a third point, *relation*; that is, the precise standpoint from which it is now proposed to consider the welfare and protection of the native. The inflammatory speeches that have been made in the Westralian Parliament reveal that much has been said concerning what is subversive of the rights of the colonial population, but what is subversive of the rights of the aboriginal, does not appear to have received equal consideration.

The terms, humane treatment—protection—welfare—rights—clearly admit of a variety of significations. It is necessary to ask, protection from what? To what sort of ethical basis, or to what standard are such terms as welfare, humane or inhumane treatment, to be referred? Is it to be a purely moral, or a purely political

standard? If moral, is it to be the Christian, or the utilitarian standard, or what standard? The principles of action are related to definite acts, as cause is to effect, and in the choice of such principles, right thought is needed to produce right action; thus the ethical principles underlying the conduct of the white fellow to the black fellow, which appears to have escaped the notice of those, who vaunt, *urbi et orbi*, their wide experience amongst the aboriginal natives, are really the *punctum saliens* of this bitter aboriginal question.

The definition of the terms protection and welfare must necessarily vary according to the character of the circumstances prevailing in the different districts. Also the chains of official and squatocratic circumstances surrounding the existence of the natives in the North-West are so closely interwoven, that no intelligible or adequate definition of what is or is not for the protection and welfare of the aboriginal native can really be arrived at by detaching links from these chains and dealing with them separately. It is necessary to take into consideration the *ensemble* and co-relation of the political official and squatocratic conditions that determine the character of thought and action in such colony.

It is not my purpose to deal *in extenso* with the various social and political conditions prevailing in Western Australia. I shall merely say that in the southern portion of the colony the Uitlander or "tothersider" element predominates, whilst in the far northern districts the *force majeure* is represented, *politically* and *socially*, by the *native-born* Westralian, or Boer element, but *numerically* by the aboriginal native and the Chinese and Japanese inhabitants. It is therefore essential to consider this aboriginal native question as it is conditioned by the prevailing facts in the North-West, and it is the relation of the aboriginal native to these facts that will determine the precise character of this investigation into what is for the welfare of the natives, and will therefore be the *fixed point* in this inquiry. One prominent fact that calls for immediate action is this, that the aboriginal native, who is constantly being arraigned before the various tribunals throughout the North-West, where the full force of police prosecutors, actuated by zeal to obtain a conviction, is pitted against him, and who is undefended and at the mercy of a squatocratic court, is treated as inhumanely as though bodily injury were inflicted on him. This fact leads to the consideration of:

1. The character of the executive machinery for the administration of justice to the black "feller."
2. The character of the justice administered.

The consideration of the latter point constitutes one of the gravest aspects of the whole aboriginal native question, and time after time the attention of the authorities in Perth has been directed to it,

although without success, both by myself and by the northern and southern press.

On January 22, 1897, the following letter, written by Mr. F. W. Teesdale, one of the oldest residents in Roebourne (Pilbarra), and headed "A Matter requiring the Attention of the Aborigines Protection Board," appeared in the *Northern Public Opinion*:

"I should like," says the writer of this letter, "to bring before the attention of the Aborigines Board, the sort of treatment they are likely now to get in the Roebourne Courts, in cases connected with natives—the only point that is worth the Board's attention are the *horrible farces* perpetrated in our Northern courts; the *miserable farces* that occur here, of natives being asked to cross examine witnesses and challenge juries, should be put an end to, and people who have not a grain of kindness, mercy, or justice in their whole composition should take a less despotic tone when dealing with natives, who are simply in a maze of wonder, doubt, and fright, at being in a court of justice."

And on November 13, 1897, the same journal dealt with the subject again, in a leading article headed "Judges and Justice," of which the following is an extract:

"It would be *manifestly* improper to allow a resident magistrate to conduct a trial involving the life or liberty of *any man*. Even in Quarter Sessions the *pseudo* layman should not be permitted to preside. Whoever such appointments fall on, they should be gentlemen with sound legal training, versed in the intricacies of the criminal law, and with some knowledge of the criminal class. We submit that no resident magistrate holding such a position in the North has the knowledge and training that such a responsible position as Commissioner of the Supreme Court should require him to possess; any one who would undertake the performance of the grave task is accepting a post he is not *thoroughly capable of filling*. Were the magistrates possessed of legal training prior to their being raised to the Bench it would be a very different matter, but when we see appointments conferred without the *slightest regard* to essential qualifications, in some instances without even a scintilla of the most ordinary principles of jurisprudence characterising the choice, it is quite time the public cried out against the *iniquity* of the Government in this matter.

"Instead of progressing in legislation, it would appear we are retrograding in legislation."

Then again, not very long since, I interviewed the Premier, Sir John Forrest, and the Crown Law Authorities at Perth, with a view to getting such an undesirable condition of things duly considered, but, *horribile dictu*, I was informed by no less a person than the Premier, that the Magistracy in the North-West was quite capable of looking after the interests of the natives, and that they did not intend to change their mumpsimus for a new sumpsimus!

Of what avail, therefore, have been the efforts made to rivet the attention of responsible persons on these matters? No remedial policy whatever has been adopted, and there appears but little chance of anything in respect of the administration of justice in those far-off districts where the aboriginals predominate, being put

on an equitable, sound, and proper basis, by those who have hitherto twitted the Board with having no machinery, and indulged in an unceasing and exhaustless artillery of devouring eloquence, to get it abolished. Recourse must therefore be made to some such method, as that adopted when Fufius played Ilione, and the ghost of her son, Polydore, cried in vain: "*Dear mother, help me!*" for Fufius, who had been busy gratifying his desires, had become intoxicated, and had fallen asleep on the stage. Then Catienus, who played Polydore, shouted: "*Dear mother, help me!*" and finally the whole audience (Horace says, 1600) rose and roared out: "*Dear mother, help me!*"

The zealous critics of the Board—whose boundless enthusiasm in respect of what was "subversive of the rights of the people of the Colony," seems to vary in an inverse ratio to the amount of enthusiasm expressed over what was subversive of the *rights of the aboriginal natives*, in a northern law court have actually clamoured with considerable unction to be allowed to confer upon themselves the trusteeship for the natives, a trust, the violation of which, so long as the natives are left to the mercy of the magistracy and the police officials of the North-West, must appear only too palpable to one who has personal and practical experience of their methods in cases in which the life and liberty of an aboriginal native are gravely at stake. The character of such methods will be best exhibited by the consideration of the following cases.

I will take as the first case that of the aboriginal native, Darby, who in the month of November 1896 was grossly assaulted by one Joseph Godfrey.

For some considerable period Darby had been in the habit of watering his employer's horses at a certain well, situated near the Eastern Harding River, Pilbarra, the owner of this well having expressly given permission to Darby's employer to water his horses there. The circumstances that led to proceedings being taken are these.

Darby was watering his horses, according to custom, when Joseph Godfrey, a boarder in the owner's "Tucker shanty," proceeded to the well, that was not far from the house, and officiously ordered him away. The aboriginal native refused to be ordered by this white fellow, who had no authority whatever to interfere with him, and on such refusal being made, Godfrey struck the native in the face. A fight ensued, and during the scrimmage Godfrey, who was worsted, received a kick on the leg, which the evidence proved to have been accidentally given. Godfrey then proceeded to Roebourne, where, according to the evidence, he had, prior to the conflict, stated that Darby was afraid to fight him, and there laid information against the native on a charge of *inflicting wilful and grievous bodily harm!*

After numerous postponements of the magisterial hearing, during

which time he was kept in gaol, Darby was, on January 2, 1897, brought before Mr. John Brockman, a member of one of the oldest squatocratic clans in Western Australia, who, until his recent appointment as Government Resident at Roebourne, had occupied the post of Inspector of Pearl Fisheries at Sharks Bay. The Inspector of Police appeared as advocate for the prosecution, and when I, as counsel for the defence of the native, objected to the police interfering in a private prosecution, on the ground that the information was not laid by that body, but by Joseph Godfrey, the Inspector said: "The police were not there to prosecute to obtain convictions."

The police, of course, had no right to interfere *at all* in a private prosecution, and the officiousness of their presence was in keeping with their behaviour throughout the case.

Recognised authorities in support of my objection were studiously ignored by the "Boer" magistrate, who pontified thus: "I think the police can prosecute in such cases."

Protests against a mass of irregular evidence—*c.g.*, the opinion of white-feller witnesses—hearsay—only met with the thunder and lightning of Jupiter Tonans, *et horribile super aspectu mortalibus instans*; and after waggon-loads of the most bitter acrimony had been introduced into the case by the police, the magistrate said: "I think there is plenty of evidence to justify my committing prisoner to take his trial."

As a matter of fact, there was not a scrap of evidence to support the committal, as will be seen from a report of the case in the *Northern Public Opinion*, which says: "The Bench ruled that the prisoner had broken the conditions of his contract for watering horses, and was therefore a trespasser."

Just imagine a dictum of that kind in a *criminal* case!

As there were persons who could and would have gone bail for Darby, who was an indentured native, I applied for bail. But the magistrate said: "I cannot grant bail in the case of a native." Consequently, Darby was kept in prison until March 5, the date of the Criminal Sessions at Roebourne, when the full force of the police and the *elite* of squatocracy and officialism all "rolled up" at the Roebourne Court. The jurors were as carefully selected and challenged on both sides as one could conceive might be done in the valley of Jehoshaphat, and the whole spectacle was as imposing as the occasion of a canonical decree, "*si quis instigante diaboli*," &c., being proclaimed *urbi et orbi*.

The Criminal Sessions was presided over by the same gentleman who constituted the Bench at the magisterial hearing, and the contest between the leading actors in the drama; the police, on behalf of Godfrey, representing squatocratic sympathies on the one side, and the counsel for the defence representing the native on the

other, reminded me of the passages in which Lucian describes two angry philosophers hurling whole cart-loads of blasphemy at each other.

Eventually, the carefully-selected jury brought in a verdict of "Not guilty," a verdict which, if one might judge by the look of dismal dismay that characterised the faces of the spectators, was a most undesirable one.

On the evening of the trial, two bullets came whizzing past within four feet of the spot where I was located; but, it being dark, it was impossible to discover the aggressor. This, coupled with the fact that the *Northern Public Opinion* of March 27 published a violent denunciation of the jury, the counsel for the defence of the native, and the aboriginal witness, undeniably proves that the case created a very sore and bitter feeling at Roebourne, where it will be long remembered.

I may here mention that, in the case to which the *St. James's Gazette* directed public attention, the positions were reversed; the charge against a magistrate who had deliberately flogged, kicked, and placed a native in stocks of such a nature that they could be removed only by being sawn off, was not, as against Darby, the grave charge of inflicting grievous bodily harm, but the lesser one of common assault!

A second case, that shows the sort of justice obtainable from the magistracy in the North-West, is that of a poor "busheeman" Chinaman, called Pin Quay, who, on February 18, 1897, was charged with hawking and selling opium in contravention of the Pharmacy and Poisons Acts. The only witness the police brought to prove the sale of the opium was another Chinaman, called Ah Sing, who (to quote from the certified depositions) stated: "Pin Quay never sold me any opium"; and, on being further pressed, added: "The defendant never sold me any opium." Thereupon, the police called two policemen to contradict their own witness, Ah Sing, and to testify that he had told them a different story at the police office. One constable, called Harris, stated: "I was informed that Ah Sing had purchased opium from Pin Quay." I objected to this as being hearsay evidence, but my objection was ignored, the Bench, moreover, deciding that it was not incumbent on constable Harris to say who had told him. The accused, Pin Quay, informed me that this constable had told him he was a fool to defend the case, for, "had he pleaded guilty, he would have been let off with a small fine, but that now he would have to pay a big fine." When cross-examining constable Harris, I gave him the chance of affirming or denying this statement, but he declined to say whether it was or was not true, and the Bench ruled that the constable was right in declining to answer.

This was all the evidence adduced by the police, and I submitted

that as there was no evidence to support the charge the case should be dismissed. The Bench, however, fined the Chinaman £10 and costs on the first charge, and £5 and costs on the second. Notice of appeal was then given, but this was effectually blocked through the technical difficulties that were placed in the way.

Another instance of squatocratic administration of justice is furnished by the case of an aboriginal lad who, in December 1897, was charged at the Roebourne police court with entering a house at night. The lad, who had been brought up by a storekeeper, in whose employ he had been for a considerable time, suddenly found himself whirled into a court-house, where he was confronted with the full force of the police and squatocratic officialism.

A letter, written by the lad's master, which appeared in the *Northern Public Opinion* of January 2, 1898, sufficiently describes the exact position of the case :

"Picture," he writes, "a brat of a native, fourteen years old, just able to see over the side of the prisoner's dock, charged with a serious offence. He can speak English very fairly, but certainly is not educated sufficiently to answer the questions put to him by the Government Resident, such as whether he (the brat) would like to cross-examine Corporal Middowney. As master and lawful guardian of the boy, and in absence of any one to say a word for him in his defence, he (the magistrate) denied my right to appear to watch the case on his behalf, saying that if the native boy liked to call me as a witness he could do so. Of course, the boy would be likely to do so—most aborigines of fourteen years old are quite alive to these points! I say it was disgraceful to see the whole force of the police arrayed against this shrinking, frightened boy, who was never in a court in his life."

This undefended aboriginal lad was condemned solely on the evidence of tracks, and was sentenced to twelve months imprisonment and twelve lashes.

In the case of the aboriginal native, Harry, *alias* Dick, who was tried for murder at Broome (West Kimberley District) in December 1896, the facts were as follows—the deceased woman, while sleeping close to another native girl, was accidentally speared by the prisoner, that is to say, the prisoner speared the wrong person. In this case, the spear went through the woman's body, just below one of the breasts, and came out in the back.

It must be noticed that the woman did not die at once from the wound, but lived for some weeks after the occurrence, and according to certified medical evidence, pyæmia had set in during the time this aboriginal woman lived. This evidence further proved : 1st, that had the matter that had become secreted near the wound on the breast been removed, the aboriginal woman would have lived ; and 2nd, that the deceased woman was taken out into the open air before it was safe to do so.

I was not present at the magisterial hearing, and consequently

am not in a position to say how long the prisoner, Harry, was confined in gaol, awaiting his trial at the Criminal Sessions, but in the end he was found guilty, and sentenced to be hanged.

An enumeration of all the native cases that have been tried in the far North-West during the last two or three years would far exceed the limits of the present paper, but the reports of native cases during the six months prior to March 1898 show that the aboriginal natives were left entirely to the mercy of North-West officialism.

A native Werrimarre, who was tried for murder at Derby on July 30, 1897, was sentenced to death; Pyharra, Barabba, and Jewanna were sentenced respectively to ten-years penal servitude, ten-years imprisonment, and imprisonment for life. In the early part of February 1898, at the Nullagine Court, no fewer than five undefended natives, Boongoonad, Bunderbung, Chittadee, Ningerbung, and Mangobong, were sentenced by a squatocratic magistrate, Mr. James Isdell, the first to twelve months, the second and third to six months, and the two last to three months imprisonment in the Roebourne Gaol. On November 10, 1897, Egering was sentenced, at the Roebourne Police Court, to three months imprisonment for unlawfully absenting himself from the service of his employer. On June 7, 1897, aboriginals Jennings and Roberts were sentenced to death at the Roebourne Police Court. On July 11 last, Kingaringo, Enepaddy, Ginaberry, and Cherribung were sentenced by a squatocratic bench to one-month imprisonment. Aboriginal Weingol, who was tried for murder at the Roebourne Court, was, strange to say, defended by a squatocratic magistrate, Mr. John Brockman, who appeared as prisoner's advocate, and, the report states, he said a "few words to the jury on the prisoner's behalf." The native was sentenced to death.

The fact of the white fellow, Patrick Nealyan, who was charged at Roebourne, on September 3, 1897, with the manslaughter of a native, called Donald, being acquitted by a jury, who, as the report states, "did not leave the box," affords an interesting contrast to the cases and fate of the defended or undefended natives when the legal positions are reversed. In the latter part of the same year, four Turner River natives, apprehended for the murder of a man named Harry, were undefended and received very long sentences. As a commentary to this, the letter written by a squatter, Charles Wedge, to the *Northern Public Opinion* of February 26, 1898, and headed, "Has justice been perverted?" is worthy of notice. The writer states: "This case will be still fresh in the memory of the public and the police—all hands on the station at the time have still to be convinced that they are guilty."

The conclusions therefore at which I have arrived, through the conduct of several aboriginal cases, are :

1. That the magistrates in the far North-West, by reason of their lack of legal training, and also of their *esprit de corps*, which is the product of squatocratic drilling and traditions, are not fit and proper persons to be invested, in native cases, with an omnipotent jurisdiction over the life and liberty of an aboriginal native.

2. That aboriginal offenders are divided into three classes. (1) Natives who live in districts settled by white people, and have committed offences against the British law, of which they are possibly cognisant, but not against the laws of the tribe to which such offenders belong; (2) natives who have offended against both tribal and British laws; and (3) natives who are ignorant of British law and language, and who have committed an offence contrary to British law, but possibly in conformity with their own tribal customs, *e.g.*, Winnernet, tried at Roebourne, for the murder of a Finn, who had captured his jin, and sentenced to five-years penal servitude.

3. That the circumstances surrounding tribal murders usually demonstrate that they are generally matters of private quarrels between the members of various tribes. It is a difficult matter to probe such cases to their bed rock, and therefore their trial, according to the principles of British criminal law, tends to render the administration of justice ridiculous.

4. That means should be immediately adopted, whereby the trial of an aboriginal native could take place more speedily after the magisterial hearing than now appears possible. This is the more necessary, since the Bench, in Darby's case, declared that it "never could allow bail in the case of a native."

5. That a provision should be made to enable magistrates in the North-West to adjudicate upon the case of a native, without having to wait for a special commission from Perth (the capital) before such native can be tried.

6. That in native cases the magistrate should sit merely in a ministerial capacity, *e.g.*, to take evidence, and dispatch the same to Perth, where a qualified barrister or a judge from the Supreme Court should finally adjudicate on such native cases.

7. A thorough investigation should be made into the whole of the social and political conditions prevailing in the North-West, which investigation should be held at each of the townships already mentioned.

8. An investigation into the character of the Westralian statutes and police regulations governing the relations between the white fellow and the black fellow.

9. A penalising of any interference, or any dealing in any way with the "jins" (*i.e.*, wives) and aboriginal women by the white fellow.

10. Abolition of the power authorising magistrates to visit the gaols in which natives are imprisoned, and there to hold a one-man

inquiry as to whether the native's term of imprisonment shall or shall not be lessened.

11. A public investigation into the evidence adduced in the native cases during the past six years, and of the particular evidence that has led to the conviction of the fifty-one aboriginal natives who are now undergoing terms of punishment at Rottneest island.

12. That a complete official report be made and kept of the evidence given in each native case that is tried in the North-West, and that such report shall be accessible to the public.

13. That counsel be permanently employed at a regular salary, to defend every aboriginal native who is brought before the Northern Court, whether it be the police court, or the Quarter or Supreme Court Sessions.

The defence of aboriginal native prisoners in the far North-West is at all times very difficult to conduct, *firstly*, from the fact that in capital offences the police on the spot have greater facilities for collecting evidence for the prosecution than has the counsel for the defence, who may not be in the district at the time the murder is committed, and who therefore has to rely, to a considerable extent, on such evidence as he can obtain from the witnesses for the prosecution by the ordinary method of cross-examination; and, *secondly*, because the services of an interpreter are generally necessary, which means that the whole of the examination of the witnesses has to be conducted through such interpreter. Thus, should there be a number of aboriginal witnesses for the police the time required to complete the case is very long, and owing to the intense heat and the myriads of flies that infest the court, extremely trying to all engaged therein. Moreover, the number of white "fellers" who understand the aboriginal dialect, which varies with every thirty or forty miles, is extremely small. In the Kimberley and Pilbarra districts there are one or two men who are usually employed as interpreters, and upon whose rectitude, conscientiousness, and impartiality grave issues frequently depend. But the chief difficulty with which the interpreters in these native cases have to deal is not the difficulty of translating the English into aboriginal, but of putting the question to the aboriginal in such a manner that he understands exactly to what he has to reply.

Another difficulty I have experienced is making the interpreter correctly understand the English question, and on one occasion I had to object to the white-"feller" interpreter, he being more familiar with the aboriginal dialect than with English.

With regard to the jury system, as applicable to native cases in the Northern courts, the great difficulty of procuring twelve white "fellers" *at all* in such places as Wyndham, Derby, and Broome, has been forcibly impressed on my mind, and the careful elimination from the jury panel of persons unsuited to serve on a jury in native

cases is, in such places as Roebourne, a matter for grave consideration.

For instance, in the case of the aboriginal Harry, before-mentioned, it was very difficult to know whether any of the jurors should be challenged or no, as I only arrived at Broome the day before the trial. When, however, the case was ended, it was discovered that there were distinct grounds for exercising this right of challenge, which is a most valuable privilege if fair play is to be secured; though, had this right been exercised in the case in question at Broome, where the white population is so scant, it would have been almost impossible to get a jury at all.

And now as regards the power of the magistracy in the North-West; in his remarks recently published in the *St. James's Gazette*, the Agent-general for Western Australia said truly: "There is no court of jurisdiction in the North-West higher than the magistracy"; and it is just this omnipotence that should be restricted, the *rationale* of such restriction being that the squatocracy has been accustomed to too great an amount of power over the native to render their official omnipotence desirable. The late Board was the victim of torrents of abuse from the Colonial Parliament because it did not possess machinery with which to administer its affairs in the North-West. The allegation was not well founded; but given it had been true, it were surely better to be without any machinery at all than to have the bad machinery that is furnished by the police and the magistracy, as the protectors of the natives. The former are the natural antagonists of the aboriginal, and how can an incapable and incompetent "Boer" magistrate look after the interests of a native? As a matter of fact, they do not look after them, and there have been occasions on which the work of the late Board was considerably hampered and beset with difficulties, through most incompetent and incapable men having been, for some reason or other, appointed magistrates. It must not be understood from this that I have any desire to anathematise the squatocracy *in toto*; far from it, some of the members of that body are very hospitable, and many a pleasant hour can be spent in their company; but what I do insist on is this, that men who have been trained from their youth amidst squatocratic associations and traditions do, by reason of such environment, and of their director indirect interests, imbibe an *esprit de corps* or *cult*, which is not only ingrained in the squatocratic composition, but also permeates the channels of officialism in the North-West. Such men are consequently undesirable persons to be appointed magistrates in native cases, or to be the protectors of aboriginals.

In directing public attention to the inadequate punishments of two magistrates who were convicted of ill-treating natives, the *St. James's Gazette* does not strike at the bed-rock of the

matter. This journal refers us to the inadequacy of the "vindication of the law, both statutory and moral." But in respect of the vindication of the statute law, I have acquired such practical experience, through acting in the capacity of *Athanasius contra mundum*, that I am strongly tempted to think that the person who announced it as his mission to vindicate the moral law in the North-West regions would require to be equipped with a good supply of cartridges, in order to escape complete obliteration!

What the journal states, however, is undoubtedly correct—but the *caput rei* is not so much the co-relation between the aboriginal native prisoner and his judge, as the inter-relation of the cosmic forces prevalent within the inner circles of the native-born Westralian clans, whose power in the far North-West is so omnipotent.

The influences, traditions, *esprit de corps*, and "Boer" sympathies operating and actuating within the inner circles of the Westralian oligarchy, demonstrate the *ratio cur* of the appointment and composition of the squatocratic magistracy, and these forces seem clearly to have operated in a case of more recent date than those cited by the *St. James's Gazette*.

Only a few months since, a magistrate with whom I am personally acquainted, and who, to my certain knowledge, is closely connected by marriage with one of the most prominent of the squatocratic clans, was on February 8 last charged before a brother squatocratic magistrate at Roebourne (West Pilbarra district) with having, at Andover, assaulted a native, called Weelaora, *alias* George.

The evidence revealed that the accused struck the native on the forehead, then struck him in the mouth with a whip-handle, breaking a tooth, and finally struck him on the chin. The medical testimony showed that the native was covered with blood, that he had a wound on the temple three-quarters of an inch long, and about a quarter of an inch deep, and, in addition to this, a jagged cut on the lip, a broken tooth, and an abrasion on the chin.

The injured native stated that his employer asked him "how two rams had died," and that he went up to speak to his employer, who hit him. Blood then came all over him, and he ran away.

Binrey, an aboriginal witness, stated that "accused hit George first. I saw him hit George with a whip-handle—George did not hit accused—George ran, I saw blood on his head and face."

The justification, forsooth, pleaded by the accused was that the native had been neglectful and impertinent, and a white "feller," working at the same station as accused, of course substantiated the version given for the defence. The result of this case was that the accused magistrate received the *minimum* punishment provided by law, *i.e.*, a fine of one shilling and costs—£1 6s. in all!

The native was then charged by his employer with breach of

contract; he was undefended, and was sentenced by the bench to two-months imprisonment with hard labour; almost the *maximum* punishment.

When, as in the present case, the issue depended on the fact of the testimony of two black fellers being pitted against the testimony of two white fellers, before a squatocratic magistrate, who could doubt the result? Aboriginal testimony to be believed in preference to the evidence of a white man, when the liberty of a brother squatocratic Justice of Peace is at stake! *Credit Judæus appellat!*

Common assaults are dealt with under section 55 of the Colonial Police Act of 1882, which provides that one convicted "shall be liable to a penalty of not more than £5, or imprisonment with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding two calendar months. What then is the precise reason that the magistrate was not sentenced to imprisonment with hard labour, instead of receiving the *minimum* punishment of a shilling fine? Why should the native have received almost the *maximum* punishment? Why not three-days imprisonment, without hard labour? Why also, in this case, and in those mentioned in the *St. James's Gazette*, was the charge laid by the police against the magistrates the lesser one of common assault, while the charge laid against Darby, in the case before mentioned, where the injuries were accidentally inflicted, was for the graver offence of wilfully inflicting grievous bodily harm?

There appears to be something rotten in the state of Denmark! The Agent-General for the Colony, in his remarks published in the *St. James's Gazette* March 28, says that the bulk of the Australians regret the occurrence of such native cases as those which that journal mentioned. It must be pointed out, however, that the bulk referred to by the Agent-General is related to the native-born Westralian, as the Uitlander is related to the Boer element in the Transvaal. The bulk consists of tother-siders (*Uitlanders*), who have again and again distinctly repudiated the customs and scandals of the Western Australian "Boer" inquisitions.

To refer, therefore, to what the bulk of the Australian people would regret, in cases like those mentioned, is an *ignoratio elenchi*. As to the case of the Anderson brothers, referred to by Mr. Witteroon, it was not the Western Australian Government that prosecuted, as he states, but the late Aborigines Protection Board, who employed and paid counsel for the purpose. This case was, contrary to the usual custom, tried in the Supreme Court, Perth, and in the full glare of publicity, in a well-peopled centre.

The *St. James's Gazette* remarks: "The fact that such cases were not cabled to England suggests an unhealthy state of private and public feeling on the matter." To me, however, it suggests far more than an unhealthy state of feeling—that is, a total absence of any public feeling *at all*. A further proof of what the state of public

feeling has been, is found in the iniquitous condition of things recorded in the Penal Commission Report, referring to the gaol accommodation for aboriginals in Rottnest Island. The public feeling that could tolerate a government that has spent enormous sums of money in beautifying the city of Perth, and building an observatory therein, and allows the aboriginal offenders to be so inhumanely treated, is sufficient to make the posts and pillars of the building burst asunder with astonishment.

The Report is set forth at length in the *Western Australian Journal* for June 30, 1899, and is as follows :

"We inspected and measured the cells where the natives are locked up at night, cells having dimensions of 5ft. 8in. by 9ft. by 10ft., and occupied by three natives in each, whilst a larger cell, 13ft. 7in. by 9ft. by 10ft., is tenanted by five natives. Cells of this cubic capacity are quite unfitted to the purposes for which they are used. The walls are *very dirty*, and the *ventilation* is of the most *primitive* character."

Imagine this during the hot months.

For natives from the North-West, many of whom have been accustomed to roam about all their lives in a tropical climate in a state of nature, it is difficult to imagine any mode of treatment more unsuited in all its conditions than incarceration in Rottnest Island, which appears to us to have none of the conditions essential to the proper treatment of aboriginal offenders.

The colonial Statue of 1841 that constituted the Island of Rottnest a legal prison, recorded : "Whereas the Island of Rottnest appears *peculiarly suitable* to the detention of natives."

As to whether the abolition of the *ancien regime* was or was not an act *ultra vires* on the part of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, I do not propose to consider here, but I am in a position to state that the members of the late Board felt they would have preferred being done to death in a less unceremonious manner, *c.g.*, by the motion for their abolition being at least discussed by the body that had created them a Board—that is to say, the House of Commons.

The present administration of native affairs may or may not militate against the protection and welfare of the aboriginal native, but two facts must be patent to all : *first*, that the condition of the aboriginal as regards the administration of justice is intolerably bad, a statement that is borne out by the following paragraph that appeared in a recent issue of the *Perth Sunday Times*, a journal not subsidised by the Westralian Government : "The truth is," says this journal, "that there are worse things done in this British colony than were ever exposed in *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Some well-known men have done their best to put an end to these scandals, but have only succeeded in raising up against themselves the whole force of the bitter animosity of the West Australian division (*i.e.*, the Boer element) running the colony"; and *secondly*, that the shudders and

appeals of persons on this side of the globe can now only be met with a *non possumus* from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, for the centre of gravity in respect of the administration of native affairs is no longer located in Downing Street—it is now virtually situated in the far North-West of Western Australia.

The position is an unfortunate one, but things being as they are, it only remains for us to trust that the feeling prompting the average Nor'-Wester to look on all dark-skinned races as inferior, to lump them comprehensively as "niggers" from whom nothing can be learned, and their advocates as "niggerphilists," will soon be stigmatised as petty and parochial, for though the native be in many respects inferior to the white feller, he, though a black feller, deserves our pleading. Did not Buffon plead nobly for the ass that was despised because it was not a horse? Moreover, the aboriginal being an autocentric, and not a heterocentric being, is a personality, from the very being of which rights spring. The co-relative of right is duty: the aboriginal, therefore, possesses a claim against society in respect of the administration of distributive justice in the far North-West.

· CHARLES W. SLAUGHTER.

THE INFLUENCE OF ARABIA ON NORTH AFRICA, THE PERSIAN GULF, AND INDIA.

THE Arab port of Koweit, at the head of the Persian Gulf and the only really good harbour in it, has to the south the district of Hasa, which extends to opposite the island of Bahrein, a place that is under British protection. No one would imagine when coasting along this mere corner of Arabia, shimmering in moist heat, that, according to Durie Osborn, it was a seed from this nursery ground of heresy and abomination, lighting on the soil of North Africa, developed into the Empire of the Fatemid Caliphs of Africa and Egypt. Nor has it lost in reality any of this early importance. Hasa is part of the wide valley which stretches from South Eastern Arabia up through Mesopotamia as far as Armenia, and therefore attracted many of the old Chaldeans who have remained there. It is also only south of a line drawn between the head of the Red Sea and the head of the Persian Gulf, that the pure Arab races are to be found. But it would require a Palgrave to penetrate below the reserve maintained by the population, who to Turks and strangers assume the bearing of strict Mohammedans. Indeed, except for the part Arabs have taken from time to time in history outside their own country there is little to suggest any greatness there, or the capacity to exercise any special influence. There are no fine buildings in Arabia, nor grand cities as in Italy come down inherited from the past, nor are there rivers west of the Euphrates. To look at there is nothing on the sun-beaten surface of Arabia taken as a whole beyond date trees and grazing stock. For a country occupied by an Arab population has always a peculiar uninhabited appearance. Though fairly numerous, this is because it is nomadic, living in black or grey haircloth tents in valleys sheltered and out of sight. The towns are mean and far apart, containing either mixed races, or Arab traders that have tamed down and lost their desert fire. The literature of one of the oldest and most copious of the Eastern languages is mainly preserved, not on bookshelves but in long Arab memories. So that it would puzzle the most experienced to say in which race or spot those qualities survive which have enabled certain Arabs to rule superbly in so many

different parts of the world when they have had the chance. What the dry atmosphere added to a healthy pastoral life does is to give a first-rate physical training to the individual, and the rest seems to depend upon opportunity. There is a bracing reaction upon the mind the effects of which are locally kept dormant for centuries, and it is only when Arabs have stirred abroad, and have been in a position to originate movements that civilisation has vibrated under the shock. Nor is the fury all spent, because when we come to examine, it is at once seen that the Arabs are hard at work everywhere behind Islam. There is also a vast and ominous strip of territory with the rainless characteristics of Arabia stretching on either side of the thirtieth parallel of north latitude from Bagdad across Africa to the Atlantic, in which Arabic is the spoken language, and the inhabitants are largely of Arab derivation. These are political factors of the present day, which, whatever may be thought of their importance, cannot be neglected. Curiously enough, it is through the rather imperfect accounts we have of their conquest of Spain that most light is thrown on what a comparatively small body of the right kind of Arab was able to do when possessed of the resources of this remarkable African zone. The six centuries of Moorish Empire was in point of art and science the most brilliant period in Spanish history, and it is admitted that the expulsion of the Moors from Granada left a gap that has never been filled. But the reason is not understood. Burke, in his recent work—*The History of Spain*—observes that after three hundred years of tolerably straightforward progress (under the Goths) the scene suddenly changes, and we are carried away in a moment to furthest Arabia, to wander overwhelmed by the vast range of new interests, with a new race, a new religion, and the most tremendous power that has arisen in the world during the last nineteen hundred years. The spread of Mohammedanism—he goes on to say—whether considered as a religious or a political phenomenon, is as yet very imperfectly understood. The East has been contented to accept it, and the West has not cared to study it. The history of Islam has yet to be written. This is all true, but can be partially explained by the tangle of unfamiliar names and watchwords into which the student is at once plunged, names of commanders using barbaric force acting under the impulse of inexplicable motives, and of remote and seldom visited localities. The only chance is to simplify the study of the phenomena by selecting the more critical events for consideration, and then seeing to what inferences they necessarily lead us. Islam has two main elements in its composition, the Arab and the Persian. Fortunately it has its weak side: it is unsuited absolutely as a rule of social life to cold and rainy climates, and this has limited its extension. But in the drier and warmer regions of the globe experience shows that it

would have even deeper root were the Arabs of one individual stock. Like all history, that of Islam is at base a racial question. Arabia contains in the first place two distinct races of Arabs. What may be termed the senior race, claiming descent through Kaitan from the Patriarch Shem, chiefly inhabits Oman, Yemen, and the south of the Peninsula. The junior race, on the other hand, to which the tribe of the Koreish and therefore Mohammed himself belonged, ascribes its descent to Ishmael, is the nucleus of the Mohammedan faith as a religious system, and occupies the north of Arabia. The deadly feud between Mecca, then in sympathy with the Kaitan Arabs of the south, and Medina, which had an Ishmaelite population, gave rise to the flight of the hegira in 622, from which the Mohammedans date their era. This was typical of the rivalry of race which broke out volcanically from time to time, and is still pent below the delusive uniformity that modern Islam presents on its surface. The planting of a strange and noxious mycelium in the soil of Asia which the hegira signalised was quickly followed by growth at mushroom speed of the Caliphate, and the conquest of Egypt from the Greek Empire in 639 by a body of 8000 Arabs armed with lances, swords, and bows, despatched by the Caliph Omar for the purpose. This soon led to an invasion of Tripoli and Tunis, and the founding in 673 of Kairwan as the Arab capital of northern Africa because at a safe distance inland from the Byzantine fleet, and it remained the seat of the most obstinate fanaticism till 1881 and the French occupation of Tunis. But for nearly four centuries real power in northern Africa was in the hands of a very small band of Arab leaders making use of the indigenous population—the Moors, or “Mauri” of classical authors, and, as recent scholars maintain, mere colonies of the Amorites of Mosaic times.

The Moslem occupation of North Africa was the work of Omar, the second Caliph. Then in the year 661 the Caliph Ali, fourth in succession from Mohammed, was killed near Bagdad, and the Caliphate was usurped by the Ommeyad family in Syria, with the support of the Ishmael or northern Arabs. The success of this revolution was, however, due to the separating out of a third party in Islam, known as the Seceders or Kharijites, obviously the cream of the Kaitan or southern Arabs, which left the Caliph Ali to depend on the Persian element, too weak to stand alone. These revolted, observes Stanley Poole, originated one of the most formidable sects which ever existed in Islam; they rejected in principle the Caliphate and the Imamate. When put down in Asia they passed into Africa, and made numerous proselytes among the Berbers. But this was not the first occasion on which a party of the Arabs had opposed the establishment of Islam as has already appeared, for it is as old as the hegira, and afterwards broadened out in the ninth century into the Ismailians and Carmathians, who will be noticed further on. To

this third party, for it still exists, we really owe, besides much else, Tel-el-Kebir, the tragedy of Khartum, and the field of Omdurman. Popularly Islam is seen as divided into two main sects; namely, the orthodox or Sunis, to which the Turks and the bulk of the Syrian and Mesopotamian Arabs belong; and the Shiah, composed of Persian and African Mohammedans, who give the Koran a mystical sense, and maintain the title of the representatives of Ali to the Caliphate. But though each of these two sects must have able leaders, the inference from historical facts is, without a doubt, that the southern or Kaitan Arabs of the highest talent have stuck with the third or revolutionary party, in order to pull the strings of empire, the leading minds content to remain in obscurity, or suffering hard treatment, except when the opportunity came from time to time of carving out independent rule under the cover of Islam. For example, Idris, who was a genuine descendant of Ali, and Fatima, the daughter of Mohammed, no doubt prompted from this source, established himself as Sultan of Morocco in those early days, and it is from him the present reigning dynasty, whose picturesque embassy was lately in London, traces its derivation. Arab conquests indeed, Stanley Lane Poole relates, surged in North Africa after the year 705. For as soon as Morocco was conquered, and the Berbers or Moors, who were collectively known to the Romans as the Numidians, a mere transcription of the Greek word—our “Nomads”—were thoroughly Mohammedanised, Tarik, who was a Berber and not an Arab, invaded Spain with an army of thirteen thousand Berbers, having with him only three hundred Arab officers. They passed from the rock of Gibraltar inland in 711, and with the collusion of the Spanish Jews, who had their own grievances against the Gothic régime, carried all before them. It took six centuries to get the Moors out of Spain. But the fact for which historians have not yet accounted is the splendour attained under Mohammedan rule, which elsewhere produces in the long run only a magnificent decay. There were very few Arabs about the business, but they can have been no ordinary specimens of the race. For Sir H. H. Johnston tells us that all this time the Arab element in North Africa was extremely slight, represented by a few thousand bold, rapacious warriors, who had, in a marvellous manner difficult to explain, forced their religion, and to some extent their language and rule, on several millions of Berbers, and some hundreds of thousands of Romans, Greeks, Goths, and Jews. For it was not till the eleventh century that two tribes, three hundred thousand strong, crossed over from Central Arabia, and those Arab immigrations into North Africa began, which have been the main source of the Arab element in the northern part of the Dark Continent, now so prevalent. By the latter half of the ninth century, or a hundred and fifty years before the Crusades, the third or revolutionary party in Islam, which had been secretly directing

all these conquests, received a new impetus from Abdalla, a Persian, of Susiana, who nourished the dream of destroying Islam with the help of the Kaitan Arabs. He proceeded to organise the dreaded Ismailian sect, a branch of which, the Carmathians, issuing from their district of Hasa in 887, attacked Mecca itself, and menaced the very existence of Mohammedanism in the East. It was the struggle of a century before Islam triumphed over these rationalistic antagonists. Old mosques were restored, says Palgrave; new built, and a white-wash of orthodoxy was spread over the religious nakedness of the land. Like a fire, he adds, the hotter for a good covering of ashes, the Carmathian reaction burns secretly on, and waits but an occasion to break out afresh into a blaze, sufficient to consume, perhaps for the last time, the superstructure of Wahabiism and Islam. But separated by the whole breadth of the Peninsula from Egypt, unsympathising with the Turkish rule of Bagdad, and hopeless of aid from the decrepit anarchy of Persia, the chiefs of Hasa can for the present only bide their time, ready to welcome a deliverer whom they know not exactly whence to expect, and meditating plans of revolt and liberty which the overwhelming weight of Nejd renders it impossible to execute unassisted. Palgrave's foregoing remarks made in 1862, when the conversations he overheard among the Arabs made it a wonder to him that the attempted upheaval of Islam was not an hourly question of an outbreak, are important to bear in mind at the present moment, because so very few Europeans are at all aware there are these chiefs in Hasa patiently waiting on events, with, no doubt, effective representatives at headquarters.

The Ismailian system, it may be observed, was at once religious, philosophical, and social. All beliefs were to meet and mingle, and they were to be graduated to suit different degrees of intelligence, so that the whole world should become one vast masonic association. We now turn to the establishment by Ismailian agency of the Fatemid caliphs, who, under the cloak of being very fanatical Shiabs, ruled in Africa for a couple of centuries. A Carmathian missionary, Abdulla, entered Northern Africa in the year 893 in disguise, and gained enough influence with the Berbers to get his protégé Obeidulla, who was given out to be descended from Ali and Fatima, but was in reality a descendant of the Persian founder of the Ismailian sect, made the first Fatemid caliph. Abdulla the emissary was prepared to introduce absolute freedom of thought and action undeterred by a single maxim of the Koran, but the Fatemid caliphs he set up preserved a strict Mohammedan exterior, becoming the greatest Shiah power in mediæval history. The fourth of them, Al Moez, began to build Cairo, in the year 969, so called from Kahir, the planet Mars, then in the ascendant. He was succeeded by the caliph El Hakim, of mixed Arab and Christian parentage.

The horrors of his capricious reign ceased in 1021, when his coat and ass were found among the Mokattam hills, but not his body, and El Hakim is still worshipped as a divinity that is to reappear by the Druses of the Lebanon. The peculiarity of the remaining years of rule of the Fatemid caliphs in Egypt, who were the puppets of the Ismailian secret organisation, was that their wazirs, or prime ministers, exercised the real power. It was by becoming the wazir of a Shiah caliph that Saladin, who was himself a Kurd by race, as soon as sure of enough popular support, that is, Arab support, proclaimed in 1171 an Abbasside, or Suni, caliph at Cairo. It is as the successors to this caliphate by transfer in 1538 that the Ottoman sultans all have derived their title as the Commanders of the Faithful. The exchange was only fair, as Tuqril Beg, the first Sultan of the Turks, became wazir in 1055 of the Abbasside caliph of Bagdad, which meant wielding supreme power. He then set himself the task of uprooting the Shiah heresy in Egypt, but his conquests so weakened the Egyptians as, instead of this, to smooth the way for the victories of the first crusade, and Baldwin's Latin kingdom of Jerusalem. To return, however, to Saladin. Acre was taken by Richard Cœur de Lion in 1191 at the end of the third crusade, and Saladin, getting ill, made a three-years peace, and died six months afterwards, worn out, at Damascus. The centre of Mohammedan politics was then shifted from Egypt to Syria, and eventually gravitated to Constantinople, where to all outward appearance there is a Suni predominance exercised by the Sublime Porte over Islam. Yet visitors to that garish centre will not fail to see gliding noiselessly among the red-fezzed and frock-coated throng of Turkish officials, who are ostensibly carrying on one of the modern Governments of Europe, slim, Orientally dressed Arabs, robed and turbaned in the plainest style, the mainstay of the caliphate because they inspire its councils, and supply the mysterious and so-called fanatical element. In North Africa it is somewhat different. Though all Mohammedans believe in a coming mahdi to usher in the judgment day, the Shiahs have a more practical creed; they predict his speedy appearance, and keep their adherents ready to take up arms in his service. Hence, as they have for centuries been strong in North Africa, and are evidently directed by the revolutionary Arab party, who are not at heart Mohammedans at all, and have no scruples except the dictates of expediency, we are constantly having khalifas and mahdis announced from that quarter, and a Senouissi, though the immediate object to be gained for Islam as a whole is never apparent. As Stanley Poole remarks in his *Egypt in the Middle Ages*, the leaders and chief missionaries had really nothing in common with Mohammedanism. They used the claim of the family of Ali, not because they believed in any divine right or any caliphate, but because some flag had to be flourished in order to rouse

the people. That a class of Arab which had conquered Spain, set up the Fatemids, opposed the crusades, and made use of the Turks, can remain quiet is not to be expected. Only Egypt, being now under combined Suni and British control, there is a break in the continuity of Arabia with North Africa, so that the entire Arab zone on the thirtieth parallel of latitude cannot, as it once did for a short period, form into an Arab Empire again. It is, however, quite possible that the wily conspirators of Hasa may encourage the setting up of a Shiah power behind and south of Europeanised Tripoli and Algeria as a means of carrying out ulterior designs on the stability of Islam. Any degree of success would depend upon the state of Arabia at the time. At present Turkish authority only extends to the Syrian and Mesopotamian boundaries of the old Roman Empire. Central, Eastern, and a great part of Southern Arabia, is practically independent territory, and so is the coast all the way from Koweit round to Aden. But Yemen and the Hedjaz are held by a large force of Turkish troops, while the strategic points of Mecca and Damascus are strongly garrisoned. The independent portions of Arabia at the middle of the eighteenth century were parcelled out among a number of petty chiefs, the most considerable being a Carmathian ruler. It was at this time the adoption of Wahabi principles, which were nothing more than a return to Mohammed's use of the sword to enforce a strict compliance with the letter of the Koran, led to a Wahabi dynasty of Arabs acquiring power in Nejd, which has been more or less since retained, and from Riad as a capital subduing a number of the weaker chiefs. The Wahabi power, however, about 1830, in consequence of the important service rendered to it by the late Ibu Rashid, was considerably weakened by his being made Sultan of Shomer, with capital Hayel, and absolute succession in the sovereignty. The present Sultan of Shomer in reality governs all Central Arabia within the Turkish frontier. Palgrave informs us that, owing to its position on the trade routes, whatever transpires at Hayel is reported at Bagdad, Medina, and Damascus, only kept within Mohammedan limits. The Turkish pashas learn something, the ordinary crowd less, and Europeans least of all. The Sultan of Shomer has had to look out for allies and friends against the hour of danger, which he can hardly hope to avert for many years. Hence he keeps up frequent intercourse with Persia and Egypt. Palgrave also learnt how widespread were the ramifications of the anti-Wahabi conspiracy in Hasa and Oman, with which he found Shomer in full sympathy, as well as the Bedouins with hardly any exceptions. Now it happens that Koweit is the nearest port on the Persian Gulf leading to Hayel, and is obviously the point on which the subtle Arab influence, that runs like a thread through Islam, converges. Bagdad is too distant to control the policy of Central Arabia, and it is out of the

way of Hasa altogether, Great Britain has much too large a stake in Mohammedan countries to allow of this port at the gate of the most vital point in Islam passing into the hands of any other nation. In India the influence of Arabia shows up against the political horizon from time to time. The Wahabi colony in Patna, and in the black mountain, gave rise to the Umbeyla campaign, and is, probably, still active on a much reduced scale. But the key of Mohammedan India is at Hyderabad, and it is well known that the mutiny was stopped by an order from Constantinople in 1857 that it was to stand fast, as we had helped Turkey in the Crimean war. How completely Hyderabad was under Arab policy then is proved by Sir R. Temple's published diary, who mentions that an inquiry he made in 1867 elicited the fact that there were about 8000 Arabs in the city under three chiefs, and that the Nizam, his prime minister Salar Jung, the nobles of the State, and even the treasury were in their hands. They were all afraid of the Arabs, because their houses, their persons, and almost their lives, were at their mercy. The minister, Salar Jung, was a pure Kaitan Arab by race himself. The sects to which Arabs belong are distinguished by the colour of turban worn. Black denotes a Suni, green an African Shiah, and the "Biyadis" or "whites" of Hasa and Oman, secretly the party of revolution, wear a white turban. One of the most conspicuous points about the late Sir Salar Jung was his faultless white turban, a sufficient indication to the initiated of the source of his progressive sympathies. Though Hyderabad is much changed since the introduction of railways, and importation of fresh Arabs has long been prevented, it is unlikely that the coterie of chiefs who regulate the fate of Islam from Arabia and Stamboul are less efficiently represented in India than formerly. All this country has to look to is, that whatever the Arabs intend to do about Islam, their policy and ours with regard to Central and Eastern Arabia, which are not Turkish ground and never can be, should in all respects coincide.

A. T. FRASER.

SUGAR-GROWING IN BEHAR.

THE prospects of indigo in Behar to-day are anything but encouraging. Recognising the necessity, the indigo-planter has turned his attention to other products which can be advantageously grown without interfering with his indigo cultivation. Tumeric, ginger, chillies and rapeseed have all been tried, not without a certain measure of success on a small scale, but it is on sugar-growing that by far the greatest hopes are placed at the present time.

So much attention has been recently called to the advantage that might accrue to the indigo-planter by adopting the cultivation of sugar that the Bengal Government during the latter part of last year appointed a committee to inquire into the case for it. The object of Government was to benefit planters generally by throwing more light on the matter and ascertaining from a committee of independent and experienced men whether the cultivation of sugar promised sufficient reward to capitalists to induce them to invest their money in it. That committee has just completed a very intricate and careful investigation and submitted its report, which deals very fully with the whole question.

The result of the inquiry is distinctly favourable, and provided the conditions insisted on by the committee are obeyed, sugar-growing appears capable of becoming a great and profitable adjunct to indigo. While setting forth the case for sugar, however, special stress is laid on the fact that the expenditure of a considerable amount of capital is necessarily involved. The cultivation of sugar to be undertaken with any certainty of success must be on strict business lines with regard to efficiency and economy, which involves the conduct of the business on a large scale and the employment of the latest improvements in machinery, and of the most highly skilled supervision attainable. Undertaken on these lines a measure of success is assured. Such is the report of the committee.

The present conditions in Behar are all in favour of sugar-growing and manufacture, which was far from being the case when attempts were made to promote the sugar industry just over fifty years ago. Then the machinery had to be sent out from home and undergo another journey by water before it reached its destination in some distant factory. There it was not properly understood, and often rendered useless by some small defect which no one on the

spot could set right. The sugar produced was not of the kind to meet local demand, and had therefore to undergo the wear and tear of a long river-journey to Calcutta, where it often arrived in a very depreciated state, and was utterly unable to compete with sugar produced nearer the market and more cheaply. Failure under these conditions was inevitable, and the failure of the Union Bank just at this time set the seal upon it, making funds unattainable for a new industry and one which had shown so little promise. To-day all these things are changed. Railways intersect Behar, and machinery can be easily and quickly carried to the factories, which are in most cases on or near the line of rail: skilled labour is obtainable, and at Mozaffarpur machinery can be repaired. The sugar produced is that for which there is a growing demand in the country, and it can be safely and cheaply transported to Calcutta or any other place.

An important consideration in favour of sugar-growing is that it does not interfere with the cultivation of indigo, the time for sowing the cane preceding the time for sowing indigo, which in turn can be cut, prepared, and sent away before the cane is ready to be cut. About land there is no difficulty, the planters already having sufficient of suitable quality to grow cane to produce 60,000 tons of sugar, as estimated by the committee of inquiry. Bullocks and carts for transport already exist in the factories: steam power and water are also available, and labour is cheap. With these things in its favour the cost of production should not be high. In the report 100 Rs. is given as the utmost total cost per ton. This leaves a wide margin, and in nine cases out of ten the actual cost would probably be considerably less. The total cost is thus made up. The cost of cultivation is put at 30 to 40 Rs. the acre, including rent at 6 Rs. per acre—the highest cost met with not exceeding 50 Rs. to the acre. Each acre produces one ton of sugar, the cost of manufacture of which is 16 Rs., while the remainder of the 100 Rs.—34 Rs., taking the highest figure for cultivation—is left for freight, packing, and other charges. At present rates a ton of sugar fetches 150 Rs. to 180 Rs. in the market, which would leave a very desirable profit in the hands of the producer. These figures have been compiled after careful local inquiries, and no one who has had any experience of sugar-growing in Behar will deny that 100 Rs. for cost of production is a liberal estimate, while the selling price is easy of verification.

There can be no doubt, moreover, that with improved methods of manufacture this cost of production may be easily diminished. At present sugar making is largely carried on on the most primitive lines. The implement used for crushing the cane is known as the Beheea mill, which is common all over Behar. It is an advance on the old native *kolhn*, but it is still a very slow and cumbersome contrivance, and not adapted to the manufacture of sugar on any-

thing like a large scale. One of these implements at work presents a very primitive sight. It is worked by bullocks, who move in a circle, attached to a pole, the circulation of which at the centre crushes the cane. Such a process is obviously slow, and the implement is so ill contrived that the greatest possible amount of juice from the sugar is not obtained. The machine, too, has to be handled, the canes being dropped into it singly as the crushing proceeds. The juice, which is thus slowly crushed out, is collected in pots placed in readiness, then set to boil in a large open pan placed over a fire lighted in a hole in the ground. These primitive methods are both slow and unsatisfactory, and it is obvious that if sugar-making is to be adopted on a large scale they must give way to later and more improved means of manufacture. They served well enough for small cultivators and producers, but no planter should attempt to make use of them who seriously takes up the sugar industry to any great extent.

Failing the ordinary and common method of manufacture at present in vogue, a newer and more efficient one must be sought, and it is here that the condition mentioned by the committee at the beginning of the report becomes apparent. A considerable amount of initial expenditure must be involved to supersede the old methods by the new, and this must be recognised as quite unavoidable if the sugar industry is to be enlarged. There are two plans open for adoption. The planter may still continue to grow and manufacture his sugar with improved machinery, or the cultivation and manufacture may be completely dissociated. The latter plan has met with a great measure of success in Australia, and by its centralisation and economy it presents by far the best prospects of financial success. It is shortly described in the report, and its advantages, if it can be carried out in Behar, are obvious. The planter grows the sugar only, and his connection with it ceases after it has been cut. It is then sent to a central mill where it is crushed and converted into sugar ready for the market. These central mills may be set up by a syndicate of producers or by a company formed for the purpose. Such a company has great advantages over the individual producer. It can enter into agreements with any number of planters to grow the quantity and the kind of sugar required: it can arrange a continuous supply by stipulating that the different kinds of canes which are ready at different times shall be grown: it can regulate the production and discover which kind of cane produces the best return on the various lands under its sphere of influence. By careful arrangement a regular supply of fresh-cut cane can be secured for at least half the year—an advantage that could be properly acquired only under this centralised system. There need be no difficulty as to the transit of the cut cane to the crushing mill. Most of the factories are within

easy reach of the line of rail, and each field of sugar cane can be conveniently connected with the main line by means of portable railway lines, with trucks especially constructed for the carriage of sugar cane drawn by coolies or oxen. This quick transit is absolutely necessary to the success of the scheme, as not more than two days must be allowed to pass between the cutting and crushing of the cane. This is one of the arguments advanced against the feasibility of the adoption of the centralised plan in Behar. It is urged that in the warmer season the cane could not be kept for any period longer than twenty-four hours without an appreciable deterioration taking place. Until the experiment has been actually tried no adequate refutation can be made to this argument; but with the facilities of transit already described, the central location of the crushing mill in the sugar-producing area, and the proper arrangement of affairs at headquarters, the shortest possible time should elapse between cutting and crushing. The advantages offered by this centralised system are so great that it at least deserves a fair trial. It would undoubtedly involve a large initial outlay of expenditure and enterprise, but properly managed the return should be proportionate.

Failing this scheme, however, or awaiting its adoption, much may be done by the individual planter combining cultivation and manufacture with the aid of improved machinery. Experiments have been already made on a fairly large scale with a cane-crushing machine furnished with the necessary evaporating-pans and centrifugal, the area under sugar cultivation being about 200 acres. Here, again, a certain outlay is naturally involved, though wherever it has been tried it appears to be justified by the results. The cost of such a machine is estimated at 5325 Rs., and the cost of working, including all charges, at 16 Rs. per day. In a working-day of twelve hours such a machine should turn out two tons of dry sugar, with thirty-five gallons of molasses. If a larger area than 200 acres is brought under sugar cultivation, a machine capable of coping with a larger supply can be obtained at a slightly increased cost. Here is a field practically at once open to the individual planter. Although the committee recognise the superiority of the centralised system, failing this, great stress is laid upon the peculiar advantages the Behar planter possesses for manufacturing sugar on his own factory. In the words of the Report:

“The Behar planter possesses a wide area of land; he has under him an army of workpeople and labourers, and is accustomed to organisation and discipline. He is, or was before the recent heavy fall in the price of indigo, in a position to command the advance of considerable sums for working capital; he possesses steam-engines, and these are set free from the requirements of indigo manufacture in good time to be utilised to drive the cane-crushing machinery, which can be connected with the engines; he has at hand the workshop appliances requisite for repairs in

case of accident; at Mozaffarpur he can command skilled engineering aid if it is wanted in serious cases; he possesses an abundant water-supply; he has extensive storage accommodation for sugar in the indigo-houses, which are emptied of the indigo before sugar-manufacture begins; and, finally, he can sell the grey sugar in a market in which there is still a more extensive demand for that article than for white sugar."

With all these advantages in his favour the indigo planter has every inducement to look kindly on the cultivation of sugar. That there is room for a great expansion of supply to meet present demand is clear from the statistics given by the committee. It appears that most of the production in Behar is locally consumed. The unrefined sugar produced is sufficient to supply the needs of the local population; but beyond the limits of Behar there is a large demand for sugar which the indigo planters have not yet attempted to meet. The average export of sugar from Behar for the five years ending 1899-1900 is given at 394 tons refined and 26,871 tons unrefined, while the import amounts to as much as 2507 tons refined and 8077 tons unrefined. That the market for sugar in India is very large is clearly shown by the extensive importation of that commodity, and it is noticeable that there is an increasing demand for refined in preference to unrefined sugar. The average importation of refined sugar into India for the last four years was 170,235 tons, while the importation for the first nine months of 1900 alone amounted to 177,366 tons. Here is a large demand which the Behar planter has ready at hand, and one which he need not be afraid of over supplying for some time to come. There is no reason why he should not be able to produce sugar to compete with that now imported, and obtain the large profit already estimated, provided the cultivation and manufacture are carried out on the principles previously indicated.

As to the question of State aid to planters, the Government has shown no intention of granting financial assistance, but has evinced its interest in the prospects of indigo planters by appointing this committee to enable them to get a clear idea as to what may be done in the way of sugar cultivation. The committee has made out the case against State aid, and the arguments are certainly sound; but the chief one seems to be that if sugar is to be sufficiently profitable to warrant its expansion, funds will be readily available in the market, and no outside help will be needed. The State aid granted by colonial governments in Australia cannot be taken as a precedent for Behar, where the sugar industry is not a new one, and the land already under cultivation. In Australia it was the object of the Government to attract settlers to a new country hitherto uncultivated, and this could best be done by assisting them to start the growing of the most suitable products and introduce a new industry. In Behar, on the other hand, land, labour, and funds

are all available if the industry justifies the proposed expansion. The best way in which the Government could help the indigo planter would be by establishing experimental stations and proving what can actually be done with the sugar industry. No satisfactory or trustworthy results can be obtained unless the experiments are continued over a long series of years, and the expense would naturally fall heavily on the private producer, and the results, when obtained, would be of personal rather than general advantage. It is here that the opportunity of Government lies. By conducting such experiments and making the results known to the public interested, an immense amount of good might be done, and much useless time, labour, and expense saved to the planter. The Hawaiian Sugar Planters Association already possesses such experimental stations and laboratories, and the committee include in their report the details of the duties and management of such stations recommended last year to the Queensland Government. The committee set forth at full length the benefits of this form of State aid, and if Government can be induced to adopt it the planter will be able to know exactly of what the sugar industry is capable.

That the report of the committee is encouraging to the indigo planter there can be no doubt. Even under the present primitive conditions sugar growing is now being profitably carried on on a small scale, and these conditions are admittedly capable of a vast and immediate improvement. If the machinery suggested is introduced into the factories, or, better still, the scheme of central mills and the dissociation of cultivation and manufacture adopted, and if attention, hitherto denied, is devoted to preparing the land on scientific principles and to the cultivation of improved varieties of cane, there is no reason why the sugar industry should not be largely and profitably expanded, and occupy an important place among the products of Behar.

F. B. BRADLEY-BIRT, I.C.S.

HOW THE TRADE OF THE WEST INDIES MIGHT BE DEVELOPED.

WE live in an essentially commercial age, when every civilised Government is doing, or ought to be doing, its level best to develop the trade of its own people, as well as that of its colonies and dependencies, should it possess such. How to keep and expand old markets, and create and develop new ones, is the great problem which we have to face to-day. Competition is far too keen nowadays to permit of anything being thrown away. Every point must be carefully studied, and even the most minute details cannot afford to be overlooked, if success is to be made certain. A successful business can only be assured by having at its head, and as its responsible servants, well-trained business men, who know exactly what they have to compete against, and work accordingly. The same principles that make a successful business also make a successful and prosperous state, and it is the application of practical business methods that alone will be the industrial salvation of the West Indies.

It can scarcely be conceived that islands possessing such a fertile soil, and capable of producing without much expense most of the food requirements which are indispensable to man, should apparently be languishing into premature decay. Take, for example, the largest island in our West Indian possessions, the island of Jamaica. Possessing a most fruitful soil, a splendid climate, and being well situated for the American markets, and not too far away from the European markets, yet, with these undeniable advantages, the trade of this island has been dwindling away year after year with a melancholy consistency, and prosperity to it is becoming but an echo of a distant past. What is the cause of this? It is without doubt attributable principally to the inability of the sugar planters of the island to effectually compete against the subsidised beetroot-sugar producers of Europe. The decay of the sugar industry has witnessed the silent decay of the island itself. It has been suggested that the introduction of countervailing duties on sugar imported into this country would rejuvenate this industry; and, although this proposal is very warmly advocated, it also meets with strong opposition from prominent business men as well as from politicians. The great difference of opinion as to whether such a course would be judicious

causes one to look farther afield for a more acceptable solution to this difficult problem.

If sugar cannot be made to pay, then why not turn attention to some other industry or industries that can be profitably carried on? Some years ago glass manufacturing was one of the great industries in the Newcastle district, but the day came when the Belgians and other Continental competitors forced their way into the British markets, with the result that the glass factories on the Tyneside languished, and have now practically disappeared altogether. But the prosperity of the Tyneside did not die because the glass factories closed their doors. When the Tynesiders found themselves unable to compete successfully against their foreign rivals in one industry they turned their hands to something else, and the result of this resourcefulness is seen in the almost unexampled prosperity of the Tyneside to-day. Now that the sugar industry in the West Indies is no longer profitable, why not develop other industries that can be made to pay? Is it not possible to develop to a much greater extent the growing of fruit, tobacco, cocon, coffee, cotton, maize, and spices, and so make up for the lost sugar trade?

An experiment in vine-growing for the purpose of wine production might also be well worth trying. The examples of Australia and California in this particular line are worth emulating. When such distant lands can secure a firm footing in the British market for their wines, there does not seem to be anything to stop the West Indies from doing equally well. Still another experiment which might prove useful would be an attempt at tea-growing. There is certainly an opening for a Ceylon in the West Indies, and an experiment in this direction might mark the beginning of a great industry which quite possibly of itself would make up for the lost sugar trade.

One of the first causes of the premature decay of these fertile islands has been the decided lack of enterprise shown by the islanders, which is so apparent even to the most casual observer. Had the products been of a more varied character, and attention not been confined almost solely to one commodity, the trade of these islands would never have gone down to its present level. When the energies of the inhabitants are turned to the production of a more varied list of foodstuffs the first step in the right direction is taken.

The more general cultivation of the soil is the next necessary step towards establishing the trade of the islands on a much sounder basis. In the island of Jamaica only about one-fourth of the soil is under cultivation, and the same remark is applicable to practically the whole of the islands that comprise the great Western Archipelago. Here, surely, is scope for development, and perhaps nothing would be more likely to conduce to this increased cultivation than the immigration of a few hundred practical British colonists with

a fair amount of capital at their disposal, and possessing plenty of initiative. If the prospects for such immigration were as widely advertised as are some of the less promising opportunities offered in one or two of the other British colonies a lot of good would be done. British agriculturists who are unable to make ends meet at home, might do many a worse thing than try to tempt fortune in the West Indies.

Strange to say, a very erroneous idea prevails in this country with regard to the climate of the West Indies. This is generally supposed to be altogether unsuitable for Britishers, and a great number of people at home are under the impression that the only thing that thrives in these colonies is the yellow fever. These false and mistaken notions no doubt account for the lack of emigration from this country to these islands. Taking all round, the average Britisher would find this climate well suited to his taste, and he would find the sunny skies of the Antilles a delightful change from our own unreliable climate.

The small island of Montserrat is a striking example of what enterprise can do. Half a century ago a little band of energetic Quakers began raising limes in the island and extracting the juice. This industry has prospered to such an extent that the island now supplies this country with lime-juice and citric acid. But the colonists did not confine their attention solely to the growing of lime-trees. They have also large cotton-fields, and arrowroot is extensively cultivated, and Montserrat, although only a small island, is perhaps the most prosperous and densely populated in the West Indies. Its area is not 100 square miles, a large portion of which is occupied by volcanic mountains, yet it possesses a thriving population of nearly ten thousand.

In order to profitably develop and extend both old and new industries in the West Indies, as in any other part of the world, it is absolutely necessary to work upon the most approved methods and with the most modern appliances. Antiquated methods and obsolete appliances are worse than useless to-day. Modern ideas must be applied to modern requirements. Everything that knowledge and experience suggest as being likely to be advantageous must be utilised to the fullest possible extent. But it is necessary to use a certain amount of discretion on this point. It is no use purchasing expensive appliances if the extra cost does not promise at least a proportionate additional income. It is here that good management manifests itself, by carefully working out how far an additional expenditure will in the long run result in an increased profit.

Another important point, which is also the result of capable management, is the practice of economy in the working of the different industries. All the great successful mercantile houses

throughout the world owe their enviable position almost primarily to the practice of strict economy in the management of their affairs. It is, as the hackneyed business phrase puts it, "by keeping all expenses down to the very lowest possible point" that large profits are made and handsome dividends returned to shareholders. Of course it goes without saying that such economy must be of a true business character. An investment which does not promise an immediate return, or that gives no direct return at all, does not by any means necessarily mean extravagance. If this was the case, the man who spends very large sums in advertising his business would be one of the most extravagant individuals in existence, but any one connected in any way with business knows very well that judicious advertising is an invaluable aid to success. The economy that must be practised is that which prevents extravagance and waste. Waste of time, labour, and material soon lead to the bankruptcy court, and unless a most alert supervision is exercised this waste soon makes its appearance. It is the practice of these most necessary business virtues that will help to revive the slowly decaying industries of the West Indies, and establish new and profitable industries that will, it is to be hoped, restore the islands to the flourishing condition of former days.

It is also necessary that more capital should be introduced into the West Indies in order to develop her latent industries. It is a notorious fact that the British public invests thousands of pounds every year in foreign concerns which from their very inception are doomed to failure, and the money so invested is absolutely thrown away. Why cannot these investors be induced to place some of their spare capital in undertakings having for their object the development of the vast resources of such promising colonies as the West Indies? Why do not more of our commercial princes follow in the footsteps of Mr. A. L. Jones?

When the resources of these islands begin again to assume a more promising aspect, and their industries begin to expand, another great problem would, in the ordinary course of events, have to be faced; but this, fortunately, has already been prepared for—*i.e.* the establishment of fast and regular steamship communication between this country and the West Indies in order to foster the trade between them. The indefatigable efforts of perhaps the foremost man in the Liverpool shipping world has already accomplished this great work, and this century will witness the inauguration of what promises to be a most successful commercial and philanthropic venture, which it is to be hoped will mark a new era of prosperity for our West Indian colonies. The importance of an excellent steamship service can hardly be exaggerated, for it is only by this means that the markets can be kept fully and regularly supplied.

A very important point with regard to the new service is that the

vessels to be run between this country and the West Indies are being specially built for the trade, and everything that human genius can suggest is being done to make the venture a successful one. Special arrangements are being made for the conveyance of fruit, so that the same may arrive in this country in as perfect a condition as possible; and with the generous Government subsidy guaranteed for some years to come, the prospects of success for this undertaking are certainly very rosy.

Then with regard to the import trade to the islands from the United Kingdom. How is this to be developed? The commercial expedition which recently left these shores for the West Indies, with the intention of bringing British manufactured goods to the fore in the islands, will, without doubt, do much good in this direction, and ought to be able to pick up much valuable information, and with the prospective fast steamship communication, a steady trade in various commodities from the United Kingdom should be developed. When the home industries of these colonies begin to flourish, and the exports begin to touch a higher level, then the imports will naturally follow suit, and it is most essential that British manufacturers and merchants should keep a sharp lookout on this promising market. The position of the Americans will make them formidable rivals, and British traders must be prepared to meet with keen competition from this quarter, and the only way they can hold their own is by carefully studying the requirements of the West Indies and supplying these requirements at a reasonable figure.

It would also help matters if a reduction could be made in the rates charged for telegrams. At present a charge of 3s. per word is made for cablegrams from this country to Jamaica, and to most of the other islands a much higher rate is charged. This is certainly exorbitant, to say the least. A number of long messages at this rate would soon make a fair-sized hole in the profits of any private concern; and considering the absolute necessity of telegraphic communication to facilitate business, the advisability of making a substantial reduction in the rate charged for cables to the West Indies should be persistently pressed in the right quarter.

To sum up, if the West Indies are again to assume their proper place in the commercial world, it is necessary that more enterprise should be shown by the inhabitants in utilising the capabilities of the soil, and in order to facilitate this enterprise the immigration of a few hundred British colonists, with plenty of experience, some spare capital, and endowed with a fair amount of foresight and resource, is essential. Add to this a sympathetic Government, and the general application of the most approved business methods, and a few years ought to see a radical change in the commercial position of our West Indian colonies.

THE INTOLERABLE SITUATION IN ROME.

A REJOINDER.

I BEG leave to adopt for this paper the same title chosen by Mr. Vaughan for his article—the only portion of it, by the way, with which I quite agree. The article, to which the present is an answer, contains the statement that it was written by “a Protestant and an admirer of modern Italy.” I think Mr. Vaughan would have done much better if he had left out those words, because, regarding the Pope, the Papacy, and the Vatican, he proceeds to deliver himself of absurdly flattering remarks; while of the House of Savoy and of the Italian Government he permits himself offensive and insulting utterances. However, were it not for the above statement, most probably I should have taken no notice of what I must regard as an ignorant harangue; but inasmuch as it has been presented to the English public under such false colours, I feel called upon to demonstrate that such an article could not have been written by “a Protestant,”¹ nor by “a well-wisher and admirer of modern Italy.” And when I shall have shown Mr. Vaughan in his true colours, I further propose to demonstrate that he was wrong in his facts; consequently that his conclusions are groundless.

The word Protestant, everywhere, is understood to signify a protester against the errors and fallacies of Rome, prominent among which is the Papal supremacy. Mr. Vaughan not only accepts this supremacy, but defends it, and claims for the Pope spiritual and temporal power. Again, Protestants are indebted for the liberty of conscience they now enjoy to the martyrdom of their forefathers. Among the Italian martyrs is Giordano Bruno. Modern Italy has erected several monuments to her martyrs on the very spot on which, by Papal order, they were burned; and as Bruno was burned in the Campo dei Fiori in Rome, a monument to his memory was erected there. Against this monument our Protestant admirer enters his solemn protest. He complains of its inscription, which simply states the fact that on the very spot Giordano, Bruno was

¹ Mr. Stead, in mentioning Mr. Vaughan's article in the *Review of Reviews* for August, has headed it “A Protestant Plea for the Papacy.”

burned alive by order of the Pope. Cardinal Manning, in one of his letters, stated, "At Rome they bury history"; and our Protestant admirer seems to deplore that history is not likewise buried by Italy's sons. So much for his Protestantism. And I pass on to his admiration for modern Italy, which is just as sincere as his Protestantism.

A united Italy without Rome for its capital is an impossibility: as well could one imagine a man able to live after his head had been cut off. This admirer of my native land simply desires to behead the new kingdom, and to make his proposal more hurtful he speaks of the Italian Court as "the Sardinian Court," an expression much favoured by the Ultramontanes. Moreover, in that article I fail to trace one spark of sympathy for the Italian people and their national aspirations. Judged by his own words, Mr. Vaughan is a singular species of well-wisher of Italy, as he speaks the most offensive argot of the worst enemies of modern Italy. Still in the same dialect he concludes as follows: "I have endeavoured to point out some facts and to make one suggestion." Well, the facts are those of our enemies, and they do not bear investigation, and his suggestion is not his own at all.

Let us first examine *his* facts. His opening statement certainly goes to the root of the question. He writes of the "weak being robbed by the strong," and the weak is here represented by the Vatican and the strong by the Italian monarchy. Now, how can a person in his right senses state that the Pope has been robbed of his own? There was, unfortunately, a time when the people of the land were as so much cattle to the lords of the land; when people and cattle were bought and sold with the soil. That time is happily over; but the Ultramontane, or Papal party, whenever it can make its way or voice its true sentiments, regrets that such a state of things is over. However, I beg leave to say that the pages of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW are not the most suitable for the quite open expression of such a lamentation.

The Pope ruled over Rome for centuries, simply because the people were, throughout those centuries, not united but divided; and because, throughout those evil ages, the Popes were able to bring into Italy foreign arms in order to subdue and crush the people. During the last thirty years of the temporal power, only by means of the French bayonets could the Papal authority be enforced upon a surging people. It was by the will of a united people that the temporal power came to an end in 1870. It is recorded in history, that on the morrow of the entrance of the Italian troops into Rome, the Cardinal Secretary of State sent a message to the representative of the King asking him to protect the Vatican against a possible revolt of the *Transteverini*, that is to say the Pope's nearest neighbours. Here in London still lives

an Italian artist, formerly a subject of the Papacy, who was a member of the National Committee by which it was decided, should the Italian Government not proclaim the territory of Transtevere an integral part of the new kingdom of Italy, to enter at once the Vatican, and kill Pope and Cardinals and all the rest; so much for the love the people of Rome had for the ruling power of the Pope. Moreover, speaking of "the weak robbed by the strong," a writer should first inform himself as to whether the "weak" was in the lawful possession of the thing he has been deprived of. If a couple of burglars enter Mr. Vaughan's house, and he being powerless lets the criminals appropriate everything, and afterwards the police step in, bind the evildoers and restore the booty to its rightful owner, who would be, in this case, the "weak" and who the "strong"? This point has been dealt with before by one "Britannicus," in a letter to the *Times*, in which, speaking of the clamour for the restitution of "Church property," he said: "Should it be urged that some of the old foundations were instituted under the dominion of the Church of Rome, that does not form any solid argument, as they were instituted during a period of usurpation. Usurpation is in itself a crime, and the least punishment that can be awarded is that it should be mulcted to the extent of its unjustly acquired booty." Therefore, I take the true argument to be that the Pope having usurped his sovereignty for centuries, by means of foreign arms and of spiritual terrors, and every other means possible to him in ages of superstition and ignorance, he never was anything better than a usurper, and therefore, as a king, no theories of "Divine right" could apply to him. However, if Italy's honest friend and admirer believes in such a thing as "Divine right" he had better say so, and his further statements will be qualified thereby; but if he is a loyal subject of King Edward, then he cannot deny to the Italians the right of choosing their ruler, as the English did, when they cast out the old dynasty. The Roman people on October 2, 1870, solemnly recorded their will to be ruled by King Victor Emmanuel II. On that day, only forty-six persons were found in Rome disposed to accept the Pope as their ruler, whilst there were thousands of ayes for the king for each aye for the Pope, *et de hoc satis*.

I turn now to an attempted comparison between the cases of Rome and of Alsace-Lorraine. This comparison is absurd: the question of Alsace-Lorraine is not between a ruler and his former subjects, lawfully repudiated by them, but between two nations, as to which nation shall have the dominion of those provinces. France took possession of them by violence, and by violence they were reinstated under the sceptre of the German rulers: the will of the people had not been consulted in either case. Besides, those two

provinces are not of vital importance either to France or to Germany. At the outside we have here a case of mutilation, but the limb cut off is of secondary importance. The attempted comparison, therefore, is obviously absurd, both in its terms and its magnitude.

I pass now to a few subordinate so-called facts. "Churches have been torn down on the flimsiest of excuses"; this statement is heedlessly untrue. No church was ever pulled down in Rome for the sake of pulling down a church, far from it; many churches have been left standing with great inconvenience to the new thoroughfares, and there are now in the Eternal City too many useless churches, and new ones have been built since 1870. "Papal escutcheons have been purposely destroyed or defaced"; this is, to say the least of it, a cool complaint. Does our friend of modern Italy expect that the Italian government should have retained the Papal escutcheons after the Papal government had come to an end? I came from that part of Italy last occupied by Austria, and the first thing I saw done there, after the Austrians had left, was the pulling down of the bicipital eagle of Austria. Why another policy should be adopted in Rome, I am at a loss to understand. Yet, since the other writer deplors the disappearance of "Papal escutcheons of fine workmanship and great historical interest," I will remind him that the two escutcheons which fall under this category, viz., that placed over the doorway of the Quirinal and that on the archway of the Consulta, have been unto these days respected by the vandalic government, though for having spared them their thanks have been the taunts and jeers of the Clerical papers.

If I read aright the divergations of a somewhat petulant mind, the foregoing disposes of the sentimental part of his case; the practical side follows: He starts it by blundering about "the Papal treasury." I must at once remind him that up to September 20, 1870, the Pope's sovereignty was twofold: temporal and spiritual, each having a different source of income. One was Catholic, *id est* Universal, as far as it could be made so; the other was national, *id est* Italian, and had to follow the changed state of events. When the executive took up the government of the late States of the Church it entered *de facto* and *de jure* into the claims and obligations of the abolished Papal government. By the way, it may be well to state here that the Papal treasury at that time was in a deplorable condition; besides a big balance on the wrong side, that part of the country had been so impoverished that the Italian Government had to spend millions upon millions for the improvement and comfort of the inhabitants, and to open means of communication throughout those provinces. To talk of the Papal treasury as the personal property of the Pope; to say that the Pope has been robbed of his income, is sheer nonsense. And to say that

the money voted by the Italian Parliament to the Pope, as the spiritual head of the national Church, was "a kind of compensation for the loss of the Papal States" is a deplorable travesty of truth. That money was never voted as a kind of compensation for the lost temporal power, and it was never intended to be a kind of indemnity for the loss of the same: it was simply voted for the maintenance of the Pope as the Bishop of Rome. To suppose that by granting that allowance the Italian Government "recognised the Papal right over Rome, and professed itself willing to pay, in consideration thereof, a handsome *solutum* yearly," is heaping blunder upon blunder. No person with the least knowledge of the law of guarantee could make the above ridiculous statement. Next, "Italy deprives the Vatican of its necessary and proper income." Does the writer mean here the necessary means to carry out the spiritual or the temporal power? If the latter, the Pope having no temporal power, he needs no money to support the same; if the former is meant, well, Italy, with its handsome gift, increased and in no way diminished the Papal income.

I come now to what I consider the most deplorable part of the article, in which the writer takes upon himself, groundlessly and ignorantly, to charge the Italian monarchy with faithlessness—a charge which cannot be uttered against a ruler of the house of Savoy. The Vatican, says Mr. Vaughan, "can never again agree to a Convention with the Italian king and Parliament alone." That little word *again* seems to imply that once upon a time the Vatican did come to some kind of arrangement with the Italian Government, while to all suggestions of an agreement, on the part of King Victor Emmanuel II., Pio Nono invariably answered *non possumus*: therefore that little word again either betrays ignorance of history or an intention to further mislead the public. What follows seems to support the latter alternative, because the writer states that the Vatican "cannot trust itself to any agreement with a power that so frequently in the past has shown itself capricious and untrustworthy. . . . with a power that has repeatedly broken its most solemn promises to the Holy See; notably by the invasion of Papal territory before the battle of Mentana of 1867, and by the capture of Rome." Here we have, at least, something tangible to deal with: the retort is easy. The Italian monarchy never pledged itself not to incorporate the provinces of the late Papal States; to have done so would have been to promise what it could not perform, because Victor Emmanuel was king by the will of the people, and the will of the people as to the unity of Italy was consecrated in the first resolution of the first Italian Parliament, which declared the formation of the new kingdom of Italy, "with Rome for its capital." (1) It was still an open question whether Italy would become mistress of Rome by means of an agreement

with the Vatican, which policy was indicated by Cavour with his significant phrase *mezzi morali*. For ten years the government persevered in the Cavourian policy, in the vain expectation that the Vatican would eventually come to an agreement. Pio Nono's *non possumus*, however, was stronger than any reasoning, and could only be overcome by the sound of the guns, and guns were employed to assert in Rome the Italian claim to unity and independence. King Victor Emmanuel passed into history as *il Re Galantuomo*, but he would not have deserved that title if he had not at the first opportunity taken the national flag to Rome, and planted it there, once for ever, with his immortal words: *A Roma ci siamo e vi resteremo*. As to Mentana, Italy's friend and critic evidently does not understand the true significance of that name. He alludes to it as an instance of Italy's bad faith toward the Pope, whilst it represents the greatest sacrifice any power has ever had to make, in order to remain faithful to its international obligations. By the Convention of September 15, 1864, the monarchy pledged its word with Napoleon III.—not with the Vatican, be it well understood—to defend the Papal territory. Three years after, Garibaldi invaded the Papal territory and the Italian Government had him arrested. Men who have lived the life of those days can bear me out when I say that the arrest of Garibaldi on his march to Rome very nearly caused a revolution in Italy, and only the assurance that the government had thus acted in order to fulfil its international obligations, could calm down the fiercely patriotic spirit thus aroused. Happily for the avoidance of internal strife and revolt, the embarrassing obligations came to an end with the fall of Napoleon at Sedan. The Italian monarchy was henceforth free to enter in possession of its capital. I could say much more, but I think I have said enough to show that the above cited statement against the honour of the house of Savoy is utterly reckless.

"Cannot the people," writes our admirer, "whose municipality is squandering tens of millions of lire on a useless monument to King Victor Emmanuel I. (*sic*) build a new palace for the sovereigns of their own choice and restore the Quirinal to the Pope?" This query, absurd as it is, demands a reply. I am, of course, very pleased to notice that our Ultramontane writer unwittingly recognises the King of Italy as the choice of the people, and so far so good; only, to my idea, it would have been more creditable, even to an Ultramontane writer, to have remembered this fact throughout his utterances. The monument, by the way, is to Victor Emmanuel II., and not to Victor Emmanuel I.; which blunder is not a misprint, because the present king is spoken of as Victor Emmanuel II. That monument is not a useless one; if any ruler of the world has ever deserved a national monument, Victor Emmanuel II., "*il Padre della Patria*," has deserved it. Nor is the Roman municipality

"squandering its money on that monument," because the cost of the same has been voted by the Parliament, and the whole nation is willingly and gratefully paying for it.

And now to Mr. Vaughan's own most original suggestion of an international guarantee to the Pope. This suggestion is an old one—indeed, is a favourite idea with a good many of the Ultramontane school. So far as I remember, however, among responsible persons, Gladstone once formulated such a suggestion. It was contained in a letter written in Naples in February 1891, to an Italian of the clerical party. The *Pall Mall Gazette* at once dissected and destroyed it. "What," it asked, "would Gladstone say if a foreign statesman, who had been a Premier and may be a Premier again, should state that the Irish Question was to be settled by an International Concert? Surely he would be the first to protest against it. The Irish Question is a British Question; the Roman Question is an Italian Question." Gladstone never said another word about it, and now, after the lapse of ten years, this fatuous nonsense is resuscitated, and by "an Admirer of Modern Italy."

I stated at the outset that I was in full agreement with the author of the article as to the title of the same, and I will now briefly show my version of "The Intolerable Situation in Rome." It is intolerable to see the *Church* the implacable enemy of the State; it is intolerable to see the so-called Vicar of Christ encouraging, in opposition to the clear teaching of the Gospel, disobedience to the law of the land and to its Caesar; it is intolerable to see the same *Church* which sanctioned a most pompous funeral for the Protestant and Freemason President Faure (who, moreover, died under very peculiar circumstances), deny the same funeral to the assassinated King Humbert, the most humane of princes, the representative of a House which has given to the Church saints, popes, and cardinals; it is intolerable to see the *Church* fomenting abroad bad feeling against Italy, insomuch that Cardinal Rampolla's policy well-nigh involved France and Italy in a fratricidal war; it is intolerable to see the *Church* patronising priests who pose as enemies of the State and ignoring those who love their country and honour their king, according to the Gospel; it is intolerable to see the *Church* threatening, firstly, King Victor Emmanuel I., then Humbert, and, lastly, Victor Emmanuel III.; it is intolerable to see the *Church* imposing on the new Queen, on her first landing on Italian soil, a cruel and unnecessary adjuration of the faith of her forefathers—the Orthodox Church of Russia.

The same day I read the article, to which the present one is an answer, the *Church* was perpetrating one of her petty acts of senseless insolence. It was on July 29, the first anniversary of the assassination of King Humbert. All the nation had sent representatives to a patriotic pilgrimage to the Pantheon; it was a solemn demon-

stration of sorrow and sympathy. The *Church* could not prevent it, but to give vent to her bitter feeling, she haughtily intimated to the government that the flags must not enter the Pantheon. Not satisfied with this, the Vatican charged an emissary to inform the king that if he wished the tombs of his grandfather and of his father to remain in a consecrated place, he should issue orders that no flag should enter the Pantheon. This veiled menace to deconsecrate the Pantheon produced an effect opposite to that expected. "Let the flags enter, and let us see whether the Vatican will dare to deconsecrate the Pantheon." This was the dignified and patriotic answer of the king and government to the insane menace of the Vatican. Over fifteen hundred flags entered and were lowered before the first two kings of modern Italy, but the Vatican knew better than to carry out its senseless menace.

If I may be allowed, I would like, in concluding, to give Mr. Vaughan, and those of his way of thinking, the following advice: Before speaking of the present situation in Rome, one must acquire a little knowledge of the true state of things as they were under the temporal power. For myself, I am fully convinced that both the state of things before 1870 and the present attitude of the Vatican would be considered as "intolerable" by any free-born Briton, and that the Italians, notwithstanding harangues to the contrary from the Duke of Norfolk or from Mr. Vaughan, can rely upon British sympathy in their struggle against an anti-patriotic and anti-national *Church*.

GIOVANNI DALLA VECCHIA.

THE GENTLE MORE.

FEUDALISM was put behind for ever; the knell of slavery had been tolled; freedom was waving high on the banner of England; a progress was to the fore. The "new monarchy" was heralded in with a flourish of trumpets. None bemoaned the days which were past; days of stagnation, of ignorance, of darkness; days when literature was of no account, when letters and learning were as dead men's bones, when the universities were empty, colleges falling into ruin, and men thought of nought but war. Now the dead world had awakened—the age of a new learning had dawned, a learning not bound within one city, or one country, but the revival which had begun in Italy was moving like a restless giant throughout the western part of Europe.

As this mighty spirit of awakening moved on, it aroused a soul of questioning and scepticism wherever it touched—a spirit of growth, painful, convulsive, averse to all stagnation. As one of the greatest of nineteenth-century philosophers has said, "God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please—you can never have both." This, then, was the age when men were choosing Truth rather than repose; when men were daring to think their own thoughts, and speak them; when scholars were daring to introduce new methods and new systems; priests were daring to preach new doctrines, and interpret the Scriptures according to a more enlightened code. Some of the *debris* of conventionalism, of custom, of devotion to old forms was being cleared away, and the gems of truth which had lain hidden beneath caught the rainbow sparkles of sunlight once more. The crust of ages was being torn off; men were daring to stand upright, venturing to act as vertebral animals, and no longer protoplasms. The world was eager and expectant. Printing had done much, multiplied books, made them accessible to the many. Learning was the fashion, as well as the delight of the day.

What then, or who, had brought about this tremendous change, this revolution in the western world? Time itself had wrought the great upheaval, like the action of a vast volcanic force. But there were men to help on the movement. Among such were the refined Linacre, founder of the Royal College of Physicians, a true scholar, a deep student of the new learning, and an ardent worker; the

famous Grocyn, first teacher of Greek at Oxford, pupil of the exile Chalcondylas, "patronus et præceptor," as Erasmus calls him, a man of wide learning and wider sympathies; the pious and charitable Colet, Dean of St. Paul's, admirer of the great, friend of the good, whom to listen to was "like listening to Plato himself"; Erasmus, the man of genius and prodigious learning, of prophetic insight, professor of divinity and of Greek; and More, the incomparable More, blameless and undefiled, with a heart of gold, and a mind as great as the wisest and most learned of his day. These were men afraid of no difficulties, who mastered Greek when there were neither dictionaries nor grammars; men of living ideas, of massive minds, of unselfish lives, and of great actions, ready at this opportune moment to help on the ponderous car of advancement. It is, however, only with More that we have to do at present.

Of his mother we know nothing; his father, Sir John More, was Justice of the Queen's Bench, a strict and upright man, a wise father who trained his child to industry and economy; a man who expected obedience and reverence from his son, and got it. Thomas, who was born in 1478, was a favourite from his earliest days: when a youth in Archbishop Morton's house he won favour not only by his cheerful, diligent service, but drew many remarks of praise and admiration from master and guests by his wit, his aptness, and quick understanding. The house of the famous Lord Chancellor was a fine school for a boy so alert and ready to learn. The host was a man of vast experience and wide influence, an intimate friend of more than one king, a fear to evil-doers, a favourite of youths and scholars. He sent Thomas to Oxford upon seeing his love of study, and it was here that More set himself so eagerly to the acquisition of Greek and the new learning. But his father was for law; Greek, he thought, was a pastime, law was business. He was anxious that his son should turn his thoughts in that direction, and rise high in repute at the bar; and so he did. But he did more than this. Law was not sufficient to fill his capacious brain, not enough to satisfy his hungry soul. In obedience to his father's wishes he gave diligence to his legal studies, working away at the New Inn, Lincoln's Inn, taking position of reader at Furnival's Inn, and spending some years at the Charterhouse in quiet study and reflection. He steadily worked his way up to the top of his profession. As his biographer says, "there was at that time in none of the prince's courts of the laws of this realm any matter of importance in controversy wherein he was not with one party of the counsel." While doing this he still found time for the study of his loved Greek, the literature which the great scholars of this age were unearthing from the tombs of the past. As Shelley discovered three hundred years afterwards, and told us in the preface to his

Hellas, "We are all Greeks. Our laws, our literature, our religion, our arts have their roots in Greece." So they were coming back to the fountain-head. More was a keen observer of mankind, but no passive observer merely, an actor upon the great world's stage. When only twenty-five he became member of Parliament, and almost his first act upon entering the House was that of rejecting "the Royal demand for a heavy subsidy." Henry VII., as More thought, was claiming undue exactions. The war which had been going on with Scotland was now ended by the marriage of Princess Margaret. The King by right could claim some aid in respect to the marriage of the royal princess. The Parliament was called to settle the question. The King asserted a claim for half as much again as he had any right to; Dudley, the premier, was for passing this bill in silence, but it was against the conscience of the new member, and he, though but a youth, stood up to defend the right, against the demand for such a heavy sum. This was related to the King, and threw the young lawyer into royal disfavour, and, what was more grievous, it acted as a pretext for the King to confine his father in the Tower.

For a time More had to remain in seclusion, and it was now that he showed strong inclinations towards a clerical life. He had long practised severities, inflicted hardships, secretly worn a hair shirt, slept on bare boards, and endured many other austerities, with the idea of becoming a Carthusian monk. It was perhaps due more to the influence of his friend Lyle, who had set before him the beauty of the holy life of a recluse, than from any strong natural inclination. But happily for More he found something better than a cowl and sandals, he found a wife, and was bound by the bonds of matrimony, rather than the monastic vows. In 1505 he married Jane Colt, a sweet and gentle country girl, with whom it was his delight to study, and read, and pass happy hours in the pleasures of literature and music. They took a house in Bucklersbury; and it was here that Erasmus was wont to find a haven of rest, where he wrote, and read, and made fun of his *Praise of Folly*; was encouraged, and comforted, and appreciated by the kind young couple. In this gentle home-life More flourished and grew in all that was good; he was indeed one of most beautiful and lovable characters of the sixteenth century; full of charm, sparkling with humour, always the lover of his wife, ever the delight of his children; simple-hearted, pure, unconscious of any greatness or worth in himself; a man who, in an age when bribes and extortion were the accepted mode, never took one present from a client; who, in an age of the lust for money, refused a pension from the King, and £4000 honourably collected and offered to him in respect and acknowledgment of long-continued service; who, when men were clamouring for royal favour, stood up and

declared against the King's wrong-doing; a man who chose to sit at his own fireside, and do homage to the queen of his home, rather than at the table of kings; who loved to charm with gentle humour the ears of wife and children, rather than pour wit into royal ears. No wonder that this man shone out as a star in the early days of the Renaissance.

When the young king Henry VIII. came to the throne, it seemed a prognostication of bright things, not only to More, but to the whole nation. More came out of seclusion and was ready to aid the new king. High hopes arose in the nation's heart as the young vigorous lad of eighteen stepped on to the throne of England. He was generous, of strong character, noble impulses, with decided tastes for literature and art; quick to acknowledge ability, worth, and goodness. More was already a favourite before the crown had been placed upon the head of his sovereign. He had been made Under-Sheriff of London, an office left vacant by the execution of the detested Dudley. Henry VIII. was not slow to appreciate the value of an honest and able man, he sought to detain More at his court, and pressed offices upon him: He was made Master of Requests, a few years later Treasurer of the Exchequer and Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

Then a shadow falls across the brightness of his career; his beloved wife is taken away, the companion of his life, the mother of his four little children—and the home is left desolate. More strove to forget his sorrow in hard, incessant work; he wrote his history of Richard III., and worked away at his now enormous practice at the bar. A man always up to the business in hand, alert and ready, his learning no mere ornament, he turned it to practical account. Whatever his hand found to do he did it with his might. Upon being elected Speaker of the House of Commons, his address before the King was stamped with intense humility, marvellous tact and grace, with an innate love of justice, and a fearless determination to stand by the right; and with this an ineffable sweetness of temper and spirit of charity. In him the King had such confidence, he chose him as the right man to send upon errands of delicacy and difficulty, knowing well that he would bring all his learning and acuteness of wit to bear upon the successful carrying out of his mission. He was sent on an Embassy to Flanders to settle international disputes between the two countries, and again, to Francis I. of France, and to the Emperor Charles V. of Austria.

In the meantime More had again married, found a kindly and domesticated lady to care for himself and his children, and once more make the little home bright and happy, though his little daughter Margaret had done her best to fill the place of mother to the younger ones—the Margaret who was ever nearest her father's

heart, and who in his death was the one to clasp his form in her arms. Then came those marvellous days which tell their story in the struggle between the Reformation and the Papacy. Luther, the gaunt figurehead of the Reformation, roundly attacked the Church doctrines, and was excommunicated. Not only was Rome the enemy of this honest, hot-headed Reformer, but the spirit of the Renaissance was "even more antagonistic to the temper of Luther." With the gradual growth of intelligence, of human development, of the use of reason, gained by the progress of letters and the freedom allowed to the minds and speech of men, Luther had no sympathy. Hence he made opponents of the most cultured men of the day. He despised reason, condemned toleration, and in abusing one false dogma set up another in its place, and enforced with equal severity blind worship, claiming for it infallibility. More, Erasmus, Fisher, were all up in arms against this "fanatic," as he was called, and grieved to see the schism which was being made in the Church, for which they had hoped such great things. More had rejoiced in the new learning, and entered into it heart and soul. His great intellect revelled in the banquet of knowledge; his simple and noble heart rejoiced in new pleasures of an elevating character for the people, the people who hitherto had had little to interest them but bear-baiting, racing, boxing, and games of levity and coarseness—or the superstitions of witchcraft, astrology and alchemy. He was a true Catholic and hoped to be able to help on the religious reform which was afoot, while at the same time to check the "revolt" against the unity of the Church. To this end he used, in his calling as judge, perhaps more severity against the Protestants than some thought compatible with the teaching of St. Paul, "In things doubtful, liberty; in all things, charity." He was "the representative of the religious tendency of the new learning in England." In close sympathy with the endeavours of Erasmus and Colet to widen the horizon of the people, like them he had no wish to break from the mother Church. He was glad to welcome the New Testament of his Dutch friend Erasmus, with its broader and simpler interpretations; to read the published lectures of Colet upon St. Paul's Epistles, which were delivered before a learned audience at Oxford; and to shake the hand of fellowship with the noble enthusiast who, when he preached, was like "one inspired, raised in voice, eye, his whole countenance and mien out of himself."

It was not with displeasure only, but in great grief that More and his friends saw the nation's hopes which had been centered in their king, disappointed. They saw "the constitutional safeguards of English freedom swept away. Arbitrary taxation, arbitrary legislation, arbitrary imprisonment were powers claimed without dispute, and unsparingly exercised by the Crown. Henry's violent passion

for conquest was the cause not only of terrible bloodshed, but many other evils. Enormous taxes were levied, the great demand for soldiers made labourers scarce, the poor were oppressed, trade in foreign countries was interfered with, parliament was too much occupied with war matters to remedy any domestic grievances. These things spoiled the temper of the people, and complaints and discontent were on every hand. The increase of crime was alarming, and the times seemed ripe for revolution. It was while sorrowing over the wrongs of the people, sympathising with their hardships, and striving to help, that More conceived his immortal *Utopia*, that great and grand work for the uplifting of the people.

It was natural that this age of learning—this moral and scholastic upheaval, should produce unique books, and thus were born some of our strongest, most original and stirring of works—literary giants, monuments of the Renaissance—that age of marvel, the remembrance of which moves the heart of all lovers of religion and literature. No book was greater in its effects, in its living impressions, its sterling worth and truthfulness than the *Utopia* of More. Most of all the great books of that age were purely religious—this book was universal; indeed in its generic character it was the typical book of this age of revival, essentially an outcome of the travail of its birth; a brave speaking-forth of the wrongs which were working havoc around—wronges which had been arising little by little through the centuries and had culminated in the reign of this king, who, with his wealth, and power, and abilities, might have been his people's saviour, but through selfishness, indulgence, and greed proved to be their woe.

There have been men in every age quick to see and ready to speak out, and condemn the abuses of the times; and, more than this, to seek to remedy them. Such was Plato, the disciple of Socrates, when he conceived his *Republic*, which should bring joy, and honour, and satisfaction to people and State. Such too was William Langland, the religious poet of the fourteenth century, who, so deeply feeling the griefs of the poor, told in the old, unrhymed, alliterative metre of the day the vision of Piers Ploughman—a protest against the wrongs of that darkest period of England's social history—a story in grim earnest of "the narrowness, the misery, the monotony" of the life of the poor. Sir Francis Bacon would claim the recognition of the same motive in his plan laid down for a universal education, a dispelling of ignorance, a more widespread dissemination of truth in his romance *The New Atlantis*. And if the work of a woman may be classed with these monuments of history, the *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* by Mary Wollstonecraft, the proto-martyr of the rights of her sex, might be considered as such—a book at least one hundred years before the times; a book which made her, one biographer says, "both famous and

infamous," the former because from the hand of a genius, the latter perhaps because of the truth it held.

Then we have the noble poem of P. B. Shelley, *Prometheus Unbound*, in which the poet lays open the beliefs and hopes of a Promethean age which is to be—the age which will lead on to the "perfectibility of man." To this end its author was ever striving to hasten his fellow men, and its teachings he was ever inculcating in both work and life. Sir Bulwer Lytton's *Coming Race* might be considered a burlesque written in this spirit of reform—a looking into the future and seeing mentally, a race nobler, happier, and freer than any we have known since false civilisation marching alongside the true has beaten down the best, the highest, and the freest in man.

And so there have been all through the ages men ready to sacrifice their own comfort and lives, if need be, for the good of the many; saviours of the people, setting up milestones on the road of life hewn out of their own hearts and brains—works which have helped to make epochs in the world's history. Such then was the great work of More, full of wisdom, of charity, of justice and kindness; written in the humour of an affectionate brother, of a well-wisher; no severe critic or arrogant judge. We can see the twinkle of the kindly grey eye, and hear the soft and modulated voice of the gentle writer as we read his words. As the *Novum Instrumentum* of Erasmus was found to be the religious views held in common by the Oxford Reformers, so the *Utopia* of More contained the views of the same group of men upon social and political questions. The work was commenced in 1516, and written mostly at Brussels, when More was fellow-lodger with his friend Erasmus. It was completed in the same year in which the latter finished his memorable *Novum Instrumentum*: an unusual coincidence, the publication in one year of two such classics. The *Utopia* was a fictitious history of an imaginary island supposed to be discovered in the new world by one of Vespucci's crew. More speaks as though he had met this voyager at Antwerp, and heard from him the story of the delectable country, Utopia, from the Greek, meaning "a country non-existent," and the Latin *nus quama*, "nowhere." In flowing Latin the relater gives a portraiture of the times, with their social wrongs, political pitfalls, moral deformities; a reproduction of the foolish habits and by-ways of his own countrymen; of the follies of the leaders and guides of men; of the hideous obliquities which walked under the name of law, and the foul selfishness calling itself justice and probity; the wrong of war carried on for aggrandisement and lust of possession, and the down-treading of the helpless. This is told in a kindly, humorous style, without bitterness or envy, or any trace of revengeful criticism. In the second book is the remedy for these evils—the story of a

land of bliss, where all is peace and order and happiness; the outcome of right doing, of right ruling, of justice, and purity. It was written before the first book, and is a description of the Utopian Commonwealth, with special reference to English policy. This Elysian country is held up to view in contrast to the condition and habits of the European Commonwealth of the period, and is a smarting satire felt by those who can read between the lines. Much of it read without reference to the international history of the period loses its sting, but in the light of the contemporaneous political history is caustic in its severe truth. More, while watching with sorrow the wrong of the policy by which he was surrounded, and while listening to the turmoil of religious dissensions, was touched to the quick. Conscious of how every interest of the Commonwealth of England had been sacrificed to the King's passion for war, he saw how the poor had been sacrificed to the rich; how the people had been unjustly taxed for the caprices of the sovereign, and how one class was preying upon another. In the *Utopia* is commended a community where all shall be well cared for, all shall have food and clothing and recreation for fair labour, and shall receive justice in all things.

In England sanitation was sadly neglected, narrow streets ill-lighted, closely-packed houses, uncleanness in the lanes and alleys; these things bred fever and plagues. But in Utopia the authorities recognised the connection between morality and health, between purity and the comforts of light and air and cleanliness. The streets were twenty feet broad, the houses had spacious gardens, and room in which to breathe and grow. Alas! few English people could read, and writing was a rare accomplishment, except among scholars and priests. In Utopia every child was properly educated; labour was never made a wearisome burden, but was spread more evenly over the community. The religious spirit of the new country was broad and tolerant, and no man was persecuted for his honest views. Old forms of religion and new existed side by side without hostility, and each man was allowed to hold any creed he pleased, for the people were "persuaded that it is not in a man's power to believe what he list." A "fearless faith in the laws of nature" and a profound reverence for natural science was their code. Priests were few, worship was simple and sincere, and utility was recognised as the criterion of right and wrong. Not the pleasure or utility of the moment for the individual, but the greatest good to the greatest number. It is remarkable that More so long ago should be forerunner of the most advanced views of the utilitarianism of J. S. Mill and other nineteenth-century philosophers in an age so averse in all its tendencies to this teaching, and still more remarkable that he should be able to propound these doctrines without giving mortal offence. It is marvellous, too, that these

problems of labour, of crime, of conscience, and of government should have been touched upon by any man in that early age, but that More's thoughts of and deductions from them should be so mature shows an unusual keenness of wit and insight; his far-reaching originality in the solutions of these difficult problems, his ideas so far in advance of all current opinions, mark him as no small genius.

More had much opportunity of studying the cases of the criminal courts of England; he was daily grieved to see punishment so unevenly and unjustly inflicted—one law for the poor, another for the rich. The end of all punishment, he declares, is reformation—"nothing else but the destruction of vice and the saving of men"; and remedial punishment must be wrought out by labour and hope, "so that none is hopeless or in despair."

Thus did this brave, honest, and beneficent man hold up to scorn the rags and uncleanness of a poverty-stricken morality. In generous words he pleaded for a thorough reformation in all departments of national government, especially for a rule of justice and a due consideration of the rights of all living beings.

It is surely something of a reproach to a civilised nation professing Christianity, that after fifteen centuries of the rule of this great religion, a man, even in imagination, should have to turn from the harsh influences which held down the people in strong meshes of insincerity and bigotry, to a land of "Nowhere," to find the softer influences glowing and thriving under a religion of nature, of utilitarianism, and of love. Sad too that a nation which accepted *in theory* the Christly words of this great man should act so contrary to the spirit as to make it possible to reward a life of truth and fidelity with death.

Now to return to the man himself. Throughout the terrible struggles which had been going on around, struggles in the Church, struggles in the State, struggles with other nations, struggles in the domestic circles of the King, More remained calm, unspotted, true, and, so far, trusted and honoured by the King. Much against his own wish he was raised to the dignity of Lord Chancellor, and King Henry "caused the Duke of Norfolk openly to declare unto the people how much all England was bound to this great man." This office he discharged in great simplicity of heart and with a pure conscience. His expression of the three desires of his heart, uttered with genuine fervour to his son-in-law, was typical of the man; the natural outcome of his unselfishness and disinterested motives. The "first wish," he says, "is that whereas the most part of Christian princes be at mortal wars, they were at universal peace; the second, that where the Church of Christ is at present sore afflicted with many heresies and errors, it were well settled in a uniformity of religion; the third, that where the King's matter of his

marriage is now come into question, it were, to the glory of God and quietness of all parties, brought to a good conclusion." Such were the wishes nearest his heart—no wish for riches, or honour, or exaltation for himself, but the good of his country, his king, and his Church.

More's home life was ever a picture of beauty, a restful haven of peace. While his children were young, he was interested in their joys and their pastimes, making their happiness his delight, ever urging them on in intelligent curiosity, and alluring them to the love of knowledge. Erasmus tells of them "learning the Greek alphabet by shooting with bows and arrows at the letters." He shared his hopes with them, interested them in the things he loved, explained his aims, and spoke of his ideals to them. Now they were older they were his most beloved companions: his favourite spot was the well-loved Chelsea home standing on the banks of the Thames, amid flowers and fruit trees. Here, at his wife's delightful six o'clock suppers, many of the great men of the day were pleased to come, and not unfrequently the King himself made one of the party. Here Erasmus loved to chatter gaily with the gifted daughters of the house, for they were learned and cultured beyond the wont of women, and yet the most feminine of women; able alike to talk the classic language of Horace, or listen to the simple prattle of children, to read Greek with their loved father, or make household matters lighter for their mother. They could propound philosophical problems with the young king, or cook the supper of which he was to eat. The great man, king in his own home, standing high in the land, on the very pinnacle of honour, was humble as a little child, the joy of his home, beloved of all who knew him. It was no wonder that King Henry had great admiration for this good and gifted man: not only had he heaped honours upon him, and showed every confidence in him, but had constantly sought his advice in matters of statesmanship and in matters of controversy and learning. He daily demanded hours of his time, and never was so content as when listening to the humorous conversation and sparkling wit of his Lord Chancellor. To More, who was not attracted to the glamour of court nor the flattery of the rich, but yearned for evenings at home with his lively and intellectual family, it was irksome to have to entertain the royal pair with his brilliant sallies and kindly sarcasms. To evade this he affected dulness, and allowed the conversation to fall flat and uninteresting, and thus gained his freedom.

Alas, the King's favour was not a thing to depend upon, for Henry proved to be as inconstant to his friends as he was to his wives. More watched with sorrow the "successive steps which led the King to the final schism from Rome." In 1531 the Parliament owned the sovereign as head of the Church; tithes, which had long

been paid into the Pope's exchequer were reserved for the Crown—the chain was broken which had so long bound England and Rome. Appeals were no longer to be made to the Pope, but to the sovereign. Henry, after much dispute, opposition, and delay, had at last over-ridden every difficulty, and in the face of Rome, which laid upon him its judicial curse, and against the advice of his friends, he determined to divorce Catherine, his faithful wife of twenty years, and marry the beautiful and wanton Anne Boleyn. To this More could never agree; and when, along with all other subjects, he was required to take oath upon the Act of Succession, which included an acknowledgment of the right and legality of Henry's marriage, he could do no other than refuse, resign his office of Lord Chancellor, and yield up the Great Seal.

Henry did not for a moment believe that his much-endearred Lord Chancellor would persist in his refusal, but was in fact too much under the fascination of the new idol to think seriously of any other matter. When news came to him that More was persistent, the King sought to allure him again to his side by favours and fair promises and, when these failed, by threats. The King was blinded by a false passion, or he would have known this godly man better; known that he was a man without fear, whom neither bribes nor threats would move to do what his conscience forbade him. "These arguments are for children" More said when the Archbishop of Canterbury came to him with messages from the King, offering rewards in the one hand and punishment in the other. So he was thrust out from the King's favour, and the cloud of adversity fell upon him. But it was with dignity and grace, and with clean hands that this man, who had never wronged a soul, walked out of the sunshine of the King's countenance, and the light of prosperity, luxury, and fame, into the shadow of ignominy and poverty, not knowing how the story might end. He bore his reverse of fortune as one would expect, cheerfully and manfully putting into practice the teachings he had given to his children, considering it an honour to suffer for conscience' sake.

He was committed to the Tower, on sentence of treason, and there was kept in close confinement for twelve months. Here his eldest daughter Margaret paid him frequent visits; she had little need to offer consolation in his narrow cell: he was always bright and hopeful, ready to welcome her with some sparkling saying or happy jest.

Thus the foolish king allowed his choicest subject to be led to the scaffold, and to suffer the death of a felon—he who, "in the general opinion of Europe, was the foremost Englishman of his time. The Emperor Charles hearing of the death of this peerless man, remarked, "If we had been master of such a servant, we would rather have lost the best city of our dominions than have lost such a worthy

councillor." Well may H. D. Thoreau exclaim indignantly, "Is it the intention of law-makers that *good* men shall be hanged ever? They talk as if a man's death were a failure, and his continued life, be it of whatever character, a success. This is not so. For the death of one man speaks louder than the clanging tongues of a thousand cities. They ring to-day, and are forgotten; but who shall forget the deaths of the men whom unjust judgment hath slain—Socrates, Savonarola, the martyrs, the Christ? They are memorable for all time. Death is an illumination—an indelible impression upon the spirit of humanity."

The closing words in More's address to the judges who had condemned him were worthy of the man. "More have I not to say, my Lords; but like as the blessed Apostle St. Paul, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, was present and consented to the death of St. Stephen, and kept their clothes that stoned him to death, and yet be they now both twain holy saints in heaven, and shall continue there friends for ever, so I verily trust, and shall therefore right heartily pray, that though your Lordships have now in earth been judges to my condemnation, we may yet hereafter in heaven merrily all meet together to our everlasting salvation."

S. E. SAVILLE.

EXPERTS.

To employ other people to do our thinking for us is an insidious form of indolence.

In many departments of life there is no alternative to this method of dealing with a difficulty. If, for example, a steam-engine has to be made, or a limb cut off, or a fever diagnosed, the uninstructed man has no choice but to leave the performance entirely to the expert in such matters. But there are a great number of subjects which, though often set aside as being the province of experts, are proper for the exercise of our own individual judgment. "We cannot allow experts to be the rulers of our conscience." When to torture or burn alive the body of a heretic was the accepted method of dealing with his soul, he who ventured to question the right of the expert, the priest, to employ this method was thought guilty of ignorant presumption. For such criticism the doubter was in those times made to pay dearly; for the power and arrogance of the priestly experts were so supreme as to brook no questioning of their teaching and authority. But "the contention of the minority in one generation becomes the faith of the majority in the next"; and those who questioned the method of the torturer, both in religious and in secular matters, have long since prevailed. Even the experts have changed their views as to the righteousness of their old method of dealing with independent thinkers. We have liberty in religious matters, and are allowed to call our souls our own without any danger of being made to suffer in the flesh for doing so. But the custom that lies upon us with so heavy a weight exposes us to be the slaves of experts in other departments of opinion. Our ancestors submitted to be "blooded," as it was then called, because the professors of medicine had decided that this was an operation universally necessary for health in the spring of the year. Who would dare to counsel this practice now, when it has fallen almost as much into disrepute as has the burning of heretics? It would be interesting to know by whom the practice of bleeding began to be discredited; for reform does not usually begin *within* but *outside* a profession; not among the experts, but among those who are in a position to consider and criticise their methods. While cordially recognising the value of the help that they give us, let us bear in mind that they, the experts, are not, and cannot be, infallible, and

that, notably in medicine, which is more an art than a science, their methods are constantly changing. This, too, not because of new discoveries ; but, as other fashions change, so do those in the healing art. When the experts in this or any other profession take us a little more than usual into their confidence and acknowledge themselves fallible, they inspire us with more respect for their attainments than when they pose as though they could not err.

As with the expert in medicine, so with the scientist, he who follows science for its own sake, and who is prone to place it above all other things, and certainly above charity and above morality. For if science (which often puffeth up) clashes with charity (which buildeth up) or with morality, it is not science that gives way.

"Some 200 years before Christ there were medical schools at Alexandria to which students resorted from all parts of the world, and in these schools were laboratories for performing experiments on human beings. Here two physicians alone dissected alive no fewer than six hundred men and women. They procured criminals out of prison by Royal Commission, and, dissecting them alive, contemplated while they were yet breathing what Nature had before concealed."

History repeats itself. It will perhaps be new to some persons that a proposal was made not long since to resume the above cheerful and humane practice by a physician who brought in a bill in the Ohio Legislature for thus "utilising" criminals. The bill, however, has not (yet) passed. That patients in hospitals are sometimes made the subjects of utterly unjustifiable and cruel experiments there is unhappily no doubt. We have the sorrowful proof of this in the statements (made without shame) of experimenters. One of these, on the Continent, owns to having "used" children in an Institute "because animals were too expensive." Another, in a case just reported as having been judicially dealt with at Berlin, inoculated children with a loathsome disease for purposes of experiment.¹ That hospital patients are needlessly operated on we cannot affirm in the absence of specific evidence, though it is a matter of common report that a resort to the knife is far too popular. But that our friends the horse, the dog, the cat, and other animals are made to undergo atrocious sufferings, in Pasteur Institutes and in physiological laboratories, in the cause of (so-called) science, we learn from the detailed descriptions given by the operators themselves when they publish statements for the information of other scientists. The public at large do not seek to study these unpleasant, nay, sickening records. And for them, the public, in the newspapers, statements of another complexion are made ; such as that all such sufferings are of a trifling nature ; that experiments are

¹ Owing to the lapse of time which had occurred since the commission of this enormity, it was stated that the full penalty could not be inflicted. The criminal escaped, therefore, with one which was ridiculously inadequate.

usually made with anæsthetics, &c. &c. Are experts such as these to be taken as our guides as to what is needful, just, and right for the *advancement of science*? Must we not exercise our own judgment and our own sense of right in considering these burning questions? Alas! even the majority of the medical profession are content to let their thinking be done for them by the scientists and to be dominated by them. In spite of all the courage that medical men so often show on other occasions, it is seen to fail them here. How then can we, the public, when a debateable subject arises, do otherwise than think for ourselves, even though the subject *seem*, at first sight, to be one for experts in science to decide? To begin with, also, experts are very seldom agreed among themselves. Take, for example, the question of vaccination, whose advocates and whose opponents can both (it seems) appeal to statistics to support their own view. Who shall decide when doctors disagree? as they most certainly do on this subject. Under such circumstances the question must be settled by private judgment, and by those who approach the subject with a desire to form an intelligent opinion upon it. It must not be forgotten that persons of mature years, and even the present generation, have been brought up to look upon vaccination as a matter of course, and the vaccinator almost as inevitable as the tax-gatherer. They are therefore prejudiced in its favour, and it is difficult for them to shake off this influence.

It is a new idea to them that, after all, the diminution in small-pox, of which they are aware, may possibly be justly attributed to the great improvement that has taken place of late years in sanitation, and in the food and general habits of the population. If they heard now for the first time of vaccination, they would probably be startled at the suggestion that they and their children should receive injections of a diseased animal product, procured at the cost of prolonged animal suffering, to guard them against the possible attack of a rare disorder. But the practice has become so familiar—and was for a long while so unquestioned—that they do not trouble themselves to do the thinking about it, which they can easily get done for them. And so the experts who happen to be in a majority get their way.

It is a mistake to suppose that the refusal to form one's own opinion necessarily argues humility or diffidence. After all, in any case, private judgment is exercised, if not in forming an opinion on the subject itself, yet on the question as to *whose* opinion shall be taken. And surely the persons who are addicted to a practice (and who, perhaps, derive a personal and pecuniary advantage from it) are not wholly fitted to be the sole judges as to whether that practice is right and desirable?

One may be guilty of being wise in one's own conceit whether one forms one's own opinion or adopts it ready-made.

And the person who claims to have "an open mind," and who in the same breath avers that he "does not care to study the subject himself, but would rather hear the opinion of experts," is quite as likely to be guilty in this matter as one who has the habit of judging a question on its own merits and without prejudice. It is Thought that ultimately moulds the form of human history. Of what enormous importance then is it that we should train ourselves *individually* to judge of right and wrong, of wisdom and foolishness, in debated questions? Is it not merely indolence which induces us to give over judgment and conscience to the rule of those whom we fondly call experts, but who are too often only blind guides?

A notable instance of setting aside the would-be authority of the expert has been reported from the other side of the world. The Government of Victoria confiscated and destroyed a consignment of "plague serum" brought to Melbourne from India by a medical man for the purpose of experimentation.

All honour to that Government for daring to do their own thinking! Let us inquire of experts *how* to do a thing—not *whether* to do it. If we want to "burgle" a house, or to perform painful experiments on animals—including the inoculating them with agonising diseases—no doubt it would be wise to learn of a burglar how to do the one and of a vivisector how to carry out the other.

But as to the justification for either of these pursuits, and their righteousness, is not our own conscience a better guide than the opinion of experts, of whom those pursuits are the cherished professions and means of living?

H. I. MONRO.

MISUNDERSTANDING AND MIS- STATEMENTS.

My attention has been drawn to an article in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW called "The New Snobbishness," purporting to be a criticism of an article I wrote which appeared in the March number of the same REVIEW.

My would-be humorous and scathing critic seems to have taken my little paper on "Mispronunciation and Middle-classdom" *au grand sérieux*. Fortunately not all its readers were weighted with the same oppressive sense of seriousness. However, the one thing that I confess interested me was to find that this good gentleman had discovered that 60 per cent. of the dukes and duchesses were ignorant enough to mispronounce the word "hôtel." Strangely enough, but this Mr. "Ogier Rysden" would fail to understand, the only one of their "circularised" Graces that I sympathised with was the one who answered him that "it really did not matter." It is precisely the answer, if in a humorous or perhaps unfortunate moment I had not written the article under discussion, that I should have returned if the same inquiry had been addressed to me by Mr. "Ogier Rysden."

"The writer" (Mr. O. R.) tells us that if he saw a marchioness drinking tea out of her saucer he would exclaim "Shame"; but he would probably pronounce it "Shime." I know I always do if I make use of the expression as an exclamation. But that is not why I think he would.

This same worthy gentleman asked the duchesses' milliner for a shift. They had never heard of such a thing—of course not. "Wad der tell yer?" Precisely what I said. But it does not follow that the duchesses had not. I always call the street of that name "Gower Street" when directing a cabman, although the surname is pronounced "Gore," and I speak to the same persons of "Trafalgar Square," although the owners of the name pronounce it "~~Trafalgar~~."

The paragraph marked 5 is not honest. I particularly said (I quote from memory) "Those persons who have little idea of what a gentleman means will continually be talking about what is 'gentlemanly,' whereas, if the expression be used at all, 'gentlemanlike' is the word to use."

Therefore the remark : " It is hoped that no one who has the slightest reverence for the English language will use either of these words," is a superfluous piece of toadyism !

The next " criticism " is not honest either : " Before Lady Grove uses the word ' genteel ' again may the writer beseech her to read the *Case of General Ople*." I have never, either in the article or elsewhere, in my life spoken or written the word " genteel " without inverted commas, as a word borrowed from the tea-cosyites ! So to object to my use of the word shows want of either common intelligence or common honesty. And I probably see and appreciate the humour contained in all George Meredith's books in a way that Mr. " Ogier Rysden " possibly is incapable of appreciating or understanding it. He also recommends my perusal of *Les Precieuses Ridicules* (sic). I was brought up on it. This would be obvious to those who had also had that advantage !

A further dishonesty : " Dimond," " aint," " wantin'," and " Seymer," are classed together in a manner implying that that is the pronunciation I advocate. Now, neither directly nor indirectly did I imply that I approved of the disgusting and illiterate habit of dropping the final " g " in the present participle. But I am very lenient—I do not expect discrimination from Mr. " Ogier Rysden "—but where angels, &c.

A delightful touch of unconscious humour is afforded by " the writer " where he imagines that to cite an " ex-Premier of England " as doing a certain thing necessarily precludes the idea of vulgarity !

" The best criticism is to be found," says Mr. " Ogier Rysden," in Lady Grove's article : " A fine ear, a delicate enunciation, and a refined spirit is necessary to the proper appreciation," &c. &c. I am not clear as to whether the word I have italicised in the above quotation from my article is a clerical error on my part out of which he is endeavouring to make capital, or a grammatical one on his. I should need the (was it March ?) number by me to satisfy me on that point. The latter I should think quite likely, however.

There is one sentence in the whole of this rather futile ultra-serious " carpatation "—I cannot dignify it by the name of criticism—with which I am wholly and heartily in agreement. It is : " . . . Of Lady Grove's tests . . . some are of an ordinary knowledge of English : others debatable : and the remainder are simply absurd." What a lot of trouble Mr. " Ogier Rysden " would have saved himself and others if he had been able to realise that that is exactly what they were meant to be !

AGNES GROVE.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

Of all the forms of radiation perhaps that which conveys to us the impression of light is of the most general interest. Very great progress has been made in the artificial production of light; we have only to compare the incandescent light, for instance, with the tallow candles which so many of us can still remember as the general source of domestic light in order to realise the great improvement that has taken place. Important, however, as the advance has been it is insignificant as compared with the future which lies before us. It has long been known that over 99 per c nt. of the radiant energy in even a fairly economical source of artificial light, such as an Argand gas-burner flame, is wasted as far as the production of light is concerned. Some forms of the electric light are more economical; but none of them can compare, as regards efficiency, with some natural sources of luminous energy. The glowworm and firefly produce a considerable amount of light with so little accompanying heat that the latter cannot be detected by ordinary means. A very interesting paper on these forms of natural light was published some years ago by Messrs. S. P. Langley and F. W. Very and has now been reprinted, with additional notes, by the Smithsonian Institution.¹ The researches described in this paper are of such extreme delicacy and accuracy that it is scarcely surprising that they have not since been repeated. It is only by means of the bolometer that such measurements of temperature can be carried out, involving, as they do, variations so slight as $\frac{1}{100000}$ of one degree centigrade. By carefully comparing the luminous surface of the insect *Pyrophorus noctilucus*, with adjoining areas of the body at the same time, it was found that the insect's light was unaccompanied by any measurable heat. Compared with a candle flame the light emitted by the insect showed about one four-hundredth part of the energy which is expended in the candle flame. It is to be hoped that these researches will be continued, especially with reference to the chemical nature of the compounds to which the emission of light is due.

¹ *On the Cheapest Form of Light.* By S. P. Langley and F. W. Very. Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. xli. No. 1258. Washington: Smithsonian Institution. 1901.

The considerable increase in facilities for travelling which has taken place in late years has greatly augmented the number of those who visit and examine ancient historical localities. To those who may be visiting Rome we can recommend a handbook on one of the most interesting sections of that ancient city, the Palatine Hill.¹ The author, Count Haugwitz, has collected a number of historical records bearing upon this part of Rome, which add much to the interest of the work. The most recent excavations are described and illustrated, and good views are given not only of the buildings as they now exist, but also as they are supposed to have stood when inhabited by the Cæsars. Much yet remains to be done before we can form a complete picture of the Palatine Hill as it existed in ancient times. For instance, the cave in which Romulus and Remus were said to have been nurtured is supposed to be situated on the south-western declivity; but this is still covered by 90 feet of rubbish. It is to be hoped that further excavations in this direction will be undertaken in the near future.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE third edition of Dr. T. H. Dyer's *History of Modern Europe*² gives the reader a complete history of Europe from the capture of Constantinople down to 1900. The immense field covered by this valuable work has necessarily rendered the task of the historian one of great labour and difficulty. Dr. Dyer, in the preface to his work as it originally appeared, said that its design was "to give a general view of European history during the last four centuries." Mr. Arthur Hassall, the able editor of Dr. Dyer's work, has revised the entire book, omitting some passages, and entirely recasting others. Since the original publication of the work, a remarkable advance has been made in our knowledge of European history after the fall of Constantinople, and an enormous mass of new material, bearing especially on the Napoleonic period, has appeared. The two volumes before us contain a full and comprehensive history of events in Europe from 1453 down to 1885. The chapters dealing with the Turkish conquests and with the relations of France and England in the fifteenth century are specially interesting. While the impartiality of Dr. Dyer, as a whole, must be acknowledged, it appears to us that he takes a somewhat narrow view of the character

¹ *Der Palatin. Seine Geschichte und seine Ruinen* von Eberhard Graf Haugwitz. Rome: Lescher & Co. 1901.

² *A History of Modern Europe from the Fall of Constantinople.* By Thomas Henry Dyer, LL.D. Third Edition. Revised and continued to the end of the nineteenth century by Arthur Hassall, M.A. Vols. i. and ii. London: George Bell & Sons,

of the Reformation. Protestantism, as well as Catholicism, had a tendency to magnify doctrinal controversies and to ignore the far more important questions of conduct and sincerity. The Reformers were, nearly all of them, only too ready to persecute those who held antagonistic opinions to their own. Luther, for instance, was most envenomed in his attacks on Zwingli. The shocking absence of all principle on the part of European sovereigns during the struggle between the leaders of the Reformation and the Papacy is one of the things most calculated to disgust the modern supporters of free thought. In reality, mankind owes more to Voltaire and Rousseau than to either Luther or Calvin. The Reformers as well as the followers of Loyola forgot the truth that :

" In faith and hope most men will disagree,
But all mankind's concern is charity."

The account of the religious wars in France in the second volume, though long, is scarcely satisfactory. The most lucid and thorough portion of the work is that which shows the progress of the Turks in Europe. In the masterly introduction the entire organisation of the Ottoman Empire is described in a style which forcibly reminds us of Gibbon. The impression made on a disinterested reader by the exploits of the great Sultans is that they and their followers had the advantage of being perfectly sincere in the attempt to propagate their faith with the sword as compared with the Christian monarchs who believed in little or nothing save their own aggrandisement. The Crusades, viewed by the rigid light of historical criticism, were very far from being wars of enthusiasm, for the motives of the Crusaders were often of the meanest kind. We can easily understand Thackeray's preference of Saladdin to the "brutal, beef-eating Richard." In fact, a cynic to whom all religions were equally indifferent might be inclined to regret that the Turks did not conquer Europe. Appalling as the prospect might seem to feeble minds, one good result would have followed, that social pharisaism and religious hypocrisy would probably be now wiped out instead of rotting, as they largely do, the very core of European society.

Signor Arturo Galanti has written an excellent book on Albania.¹ The Albanians are a brave race, and have had a distinguished history. The chapters on the origin of the Albanians show that they are of Thracio-Illyric stock. They have always been passionate lovers of freedom and intensely warlike. The account given of John Castriot, the valiant Albanian prince, is almost as fascinating as the pages of romance.

Never was there more interest taken in China than there is at the present time. M. Maurice Courant's work, *En Chine*,² will be

¹ *L'Albanie*. By Arturo Galanti. Roma: Società Editrice Dante Alighieri.

² *En Chine : Mœurs et Institutions, Hommes et Faits*. Par Maurice Courant. Paris : Felix Alcan, Editeur, Ancienne Librairie. Germer, Baillière et Cie.

eagerly read. M. Courant was formerly interpreter to the French Legation at Peking, and has been a lecturer at the University of Lyons. He understands Chinese life thoroughly, and his picture of it is not unfavourable. The Chinese are a strange people, intensely conservative, but by no means uncivilised. In their family life, ancestor worship plays a prominent part. Female children are regarded as of much less importance than male children. In China there are innumerable secret societies of the most curious description. Even the beggars of China have a strong organisation. The government of the country is weak, while the various societies are powerful. This explains much of the anarchy that prevailed in China during the recent disturbances which caused so much excitement throughout Europe. The volume deserves careful study, as it throws light on an interesting subject.

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. LOUIS BECKE possesses much of the magic which fascinates the readers of Robert Louis Stevenson, but he lacks Stevenson's perfection of style. In fact, he writes in a somewhat uncouth fashion. But he knows his subject thoroughly, and the result is that his stories are marvellously—sometimes painfully—lifelike. In *Tessa* and *The Trader's Wife*¹ he gives us two capital tales of adventure. The villainy of Chard, the supercargo in *Tessa*, seems rather exaggerated. However, it is not easy to form an abstract idea of the possibilities of rascality on the high seas. *The Trader's Wife* is a startling story of a husband's vengeance on an unfaithful wife. We scarcely expect the sympathies of every reader to be on the side of the husband. In fact, he seems to us to be at heart a perfect savage. The book is not, perhaps, the most favourable specimen of Mr. Becke's talent as a writer of fiction. He is not, in the highest sense of the word, an artist, but he has vigour and grip of reality: and this is something in an age of ridiculously unreal novels like the works of Mr. Hall Caine, Mr. Rider Haggard, and Miss Marie Corelli.

*Sporting Sorrows*² is the title given by Mr. Fox Russell to an amusing little volume chiefly consisting of sketches, which originally appeared in the pages of *Punch*. The first sketch, "The Sorrows of a Fisherman," is rather an obvious piece of artificial humour. Mr. Russell holds up Scotchmen to ridicule; but the Scot is more canny than ridiculous in real life. The closing sketch, entitled "A President of Oceania," presents us with a really clever picture of a

¹ *Tessa. The Trader's Wife.* By Louis Becke. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

² *Sporting Sorrows.* By Fox Russell. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

Yankee "bossing" a beautiful island in the Pacific. The author rather overdoes the "'Murrican" accent. If the reader is, however, not over critical, he will enjoy Mr. Fox Russell's fun.

POETRY.

MR. ALEISTER CROWLEY¹ is a poet who is apparently under the obsession of an esoteric view of life and human destiny. He endeavours to grapple with the dark problems which exercised the imagination of John Ford. He views the sexual problem from the standpoint of an unconventional student of human nature. His creed is a singular mixture of belief in Osiris and in Christ. The principal poem in his new volume is a powerful dramatic sketch ending in something like a tragic farce. The love of a man for his own mother, not according to a moral but a sexual standard, is not quite a novel idea, but Mr. Crowley handles the subject in a revolting fashion, which the Greek poets avoided, owing to their keen artistic sensibility. Some passages in this drama are really very fine; and "The Fatal Force" is also a dramatic poem of singular power, though the subject is equally horrible. There is scarcely a poem in the entire volume free from morbidity; and yet it is impossible to deny that Mr. Crowley has a claim to recognition as a true poet. Most men who have thought deeply on life's problems recognise that the current religion of nearly all their fellow men is an idle mockery. The relations of men and women, as well as the constitution of states and families, are based largely on organised lies. We cannot shrink from looking behind the veil, and asking ourselves—What is life at best? Is it materialism and obscenity? or is it a sickening comedy in which nobody cares whether the consequences of his actions are injurious to others or not? Mr. Crowley seems to hold that the world is reeking with rotteness—and he is, to a great extent, right. His poems, "Mors Janua Amoris" and "The Whore in Heaven," will horrify the votaries of Mrs. Grundy. At the same time, these daring verses contain a large share of elementary truth. But we live in a hypocritical age, and apparently the author of these extraordinary poems realises the fact, for his volume is "privately printed." The epilogue, "A Death in Sicily," is really a magnificent poem—pagan in its intensity and vividness of colouring; but the prudes who think nakedness impurity and who abjectly fear death will denounce this really gifted poet as "immoral."

¹ *The Mother's Tragedy and Other Poems.* By Aleister Crowley. Privately printed. 1901.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLVI. No. 5.—NOVEMBER 1901.

A PIRATE EMPIRE.

THE POLICY OF GRAB.

THE giant's strength has been used, after the manner of giants, mercilessly. An unjust, immoral, unprovoked, and most sanguinary war, and, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, a war of shameless aggression, as will be shown in the course of these pages, has been carried on for two years—a war of piracy set on foot by the heterodox half of what is regarded as a Christian and civilised empire; an empire whose sovereign assumes the title of “Defender of the Faith” of Christ; and waged, moreover, upon two heroic, though numerically weak, Christian States, far away at the other side of the world; whose people are admitted on all hands to be honourable, brave, virtuous and sincere in their religious beliefs, and whose independence was supposed to be for ever safeguarded and secured by treaties solemnly entered into, signed, sealed, and delivered, under the sanction of her Majesty Queen Victoria, the late reigning Sovereign of Great Britain.

If, in writing these pages, I am impelled to employ strong and plain language, the strongest and plainest that literary decorum permits me to use, it is because I feel there has been too much forbearance on the part of many speakers and writers, who, although they take a right view of the subject, have shown a certain hesitancy about characterising the motives and action of the British Government in South Africa as they deserve to be characterised. To use a homely, but expressive, phrase, they shrink from calling a spade a spade. Now, to dress up truth in the gaudy livery of Court etiquette is not the best way to arouse in the breasts of average Englishmen a just sense of the frightful wrongs committed by the

Government in their name, for which they are daily incurring a crushing load of moral guilt, and greater financial liabilities than the nation was ever called upon to undertake ; already over £100,000,000 have disappeared in the melting-pot. Another, and the most serious as it is the most heart-breaking item in the account, is the butcher's bill. The tens of thousands of valuable lives gone to swell the dead list can never be recalled ; but what does the Government that brought on the war for the sake of a petty political object care ? What do the Mammon worshippers, the millionaires and magnates of the Stock Exchange, the company promoters, the speculators, and the bulls and bears care for all the bloodshed ? It sits as lightly upon them as the human sacrifices offered to Moloch in the Valley of Tophet 3000 years ago, although the agonised cries of the victims offered up to Mammon in South Africa are daily and hourly ringing in their ears. The "cheap generosity" with which the nation's hardly earned income is being squandered may be gathered from the fact that out of the 250,000 British soldiers engaged in the war, a single individual has had a gratuity of £100,000 paid him for his share in the inglorious and disgraceful enterprise. Such leaders of English opinion as Lord Salisbury, Mr. Arthur J. Balfour, Mr. Chamberlain, and a number of lesser lights, professed themselves, over and over again, not only willing but anxious to respect and cherish the national life and territorial possessions of the Boers. Well, in the face of those treaties and professions, the greatest military force England ever put into the field—a force exceeding 250,000 men—drawn from many lands and provided and equipped with all the newest inventions of modern warfare, was sent out to overwhelm the two Republics and to annex them to the already unwieldy British Empire. How appropriately may the following lines from Milton be applied to the situation :

"They err who count it glorious to subdue
By conquest far and wide, to over-run
Large countries, and in field great battles win,
Great cities by assault : What do these worthies
But rob and spoil, burn, slaughter, and enslave
Peaceable nations, neighbouring or remote,
Made captive, yet deserving freedom more
Than those their conquerors, who leave behind
Nothing but ruin wheresoe'er they rove,
And all the flourishing works of peace destroy ;
Then swell with pride, and must be titled (Lords),
Great Benefactors of Mankind, Deliverers."

The magnitude of the invading force is sufficient of itself to show the desperate intentions of the British Government. The Boers never had an army, properly so called. The utmost numbers they could muster to defend their country against such overwhelming

odds did not exceed 40,000 men, most of whom never had any experience of war. Well, as just said, the lives of tens of thousands of brave men, from the prince and the peer to the peasant, have been sacrificed in, *for England*, the inglorious and disgraceful contest between David and Goliath, between might and right, a contest during which inconceivable sufferings have been caused on both sides. The sufferings on the side of the British may, perhaps, be assuaged by the titles of honour and immense pecuniary rewards lavished, not upon the non-commissioned officers and soldiers who did the fighting, but upon the leaders of the mighty host sent out to crush the Boers. The rank and file will have to content themselves with the medals and bits of ribbon graciously bestowed upon them by Royalty's own hands. In some cases, however, it is stated, the honour was declined. But what can compensate the unfortunate people of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State for the unutterable wrongs they have had to endure? They have lost all they held most dear—fathers, sons, and brothers “butchered to make a British holiday”—not to speak of the ruined homes, the devastated fields, the wholesale destruction of property of every description, and the consequent withering away by famine and disease of thousands of helpless women and innocent children. Only Milton's sublime verse can supply an image of the situation before and after :

“This continent of spacious Heaven, adorned
With plant, fruit, flower ambrosial, gems and gold.”

This was South Africa before England turned her avaricious eyes upon its wealth and luxuriance, its teeming harvests, its rich pastures covered with flocks and herds, and its inexhaustible mines of gold and precious gems. Behold it now, changed from a terrestrial paradise into a blackened waste, a charnel-house strewn with uncoffined dead, the skeletons of martyred men :

“The pleasant valley of Hinnom, Tophet thence,
And black Gehenna called the type of Hell.”

What are the Christian Churches about that they make not an effort to save England from the deep damnation that, unless she repents and makes reparation for the blood she has spilt and the devastation she has wrought, must, unless Christianity is a fiction and the science of ethics a fraud, inevitably follow upon the atrocities committed and still committing in South Africa? Many people will think it not too much to have hoped that the ministers of the Christian Churches would have spoken out plainly and fearlessly in denunciation of England's crimes, and warned her of the fate in store for the habitual and case-hardened criminal. A few good men, animated by the spirit of justice and righteousness, have, indeed, done their duty and spoken out bravely, among whom may be mentioned Canon Hicks, of Manchester; Mr. G. R. Thorne, in the

Primitive Methodist Chapel at Bradley, near Wolverhampton ; and Rev. H. M. Kennedy, Vicar of Plumpton, Cumberland. But what are these amongst so many ? How can they hope to work a miracle, or to make an impression upon the debased mind of the impenitent thief, when the vast majority of the Church of England, with archbishops, bishops, and other dignitaries at their heads, are either dumb, acquiescent, tacitly approving, or else, like the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, publicly blessing the cause and issuing forms of prayer for the success of the British arms ?

I have before me the case of a dignitary of Christchurch Cathedral, who, speaking a short time ago at a meeting of the College Historical Society, in Trinity College, Dublin, did not scruple to address the youthful *alumni* of that great university in the following words, the subject being " Britain's Colonial Policy " :

" Canon Carnichael, in proposing that the paper (the auditor's address) be printed at the expense of the Society, said wherever the flag of England flew it meant liberty of mind and body and soul, toleration, free thought, and an open market for the world. Therefore he was for the policy of Grab. In the cause of humanity they ought to grab all they possibly could. If it should come about that they would have to fight they would do it with clear consciences and a stout heart, knowing freedom would follow in the wake of their ships."

I have referred to this outburst before, and introduce it here again as a forcible illustration of the ideas that are promulgated by some people who are accounted good Christians. A more savage, truculent, and impious utterance never issued from the lips of mortal man, much less from the lips of a dignitary of the Protestant Church commissioned to teach the precepts embodied in " the Sermon upon the Mount." It is a manifest incitement to national robbery and murder by one whose mission it is to preach the gospel of love and mercy, not of piracy and plunder :

" Can this mean peace, the calmness of the good,
Or guilt grown old in desperate hardihood ?"

For the honour of humanity there is something to set against such atrocious clerical declamation. Just as England was on the eve of drawing the sword and putting in motion all the strength of her mighty military and naval resources to rob the Transvaal of its gold mines, and to attempt the extermination of a brave, just, upright and Christian people, an eminent and high-minded British statesman, Mr. John Morley, speaking to his constituents, asked the question, " Were they (the Government) going to war in order that they might have their hands free to tear up a treaty to which they had solemnly set their seal, and to wipe out—to crush—a little State whose independence they had repeatedly declared their intense anxiety to respect and cherish ?"

Mr. Morley concluded a powerful and convincing speech in favour

of the independence of the Transvaal and of the maintenance of peace with the startling words, "we do not want a pirate empire." It will not be denied that the Right Hon. John Morley is as good and upright a statesman as—say the Right Hon. Arthur J. Balfour, but there is this difference between them, and it is a fundamental, a radical one: Mr. Morley condemns and abhors the policy of the pirate and grabber, Mr. Balfour approves of it, justifies and glories in it. Yet it may be said of him, as it was said of the pirate Lambro:

"You're wrong; he is the mildest mannered man
That ever scuttled ship or cut a throat.
With such true breeding of a gentleman
You never could divine his real thought."

Not that any one would dream of suggesting that Mr. Balfour ever committed piracy, literary or otherwise, in his own person—*qui facit per alium furit per se* is, however, a familiar aphorism, and may be applied to the whole body of the Jingo Government, without any distinction whatever. They are each and all tarred with the same brush, the tar being particularly loathsome and evil smelling from the admixture of so much putrefying human blood.

Mr. John Morley is not the only eminent Englishman who has denounced the piratical policy of the British Government in South Africa. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Leonard Courtney, Mr. Thomas Shaw, Mr. Bryce, Sir William Harcourt, and numerous others have put their stigma upon it. Take the utterances of Sir William Harcourt, who is perhaps the most experienced statesman now in the British Empire. He has not hesitated to brand this piratical war with the red hot iron of his righteous indignation. Speaking to his constituents in September 1899, on the eve of the breaking out of hostilities, he, in the course of his condemnation of the Government policy, quoted from a speech, made after Majuba in defence of the rights of the Boers, in which Mr. Chamberlain, now Colonial Secretary in the Jingo Government said "the Boers are not naturally a warlike race, they inherit from their ancestors their unconquered love of freedom and liberty . . . is it against such a nation that we are to be called upon to exercise the dread arbitrament of war?" When I first read this effusive expression of Mr. Chamberlain's tender feelings towards the Boers it occurred to my mind that it was altogether too sweet to be wholesome, and time has justified the suspicion. Well, "the dread arbitrament of war" has been exercised with a vengeance, and exercised too under the auspices, and by the complicity of this very same Mr. Chamberlain who, when he was in a state of grace, so strongly deprecated the commission of such a crime—*Tempora mutantur*—times have changed, and he has changed with them. The erstwhile leader of the Radicals on the march to the promised land of Arcadia where,

according to the Birmingham programme "three acres and a cow," with various other advantages, not forgetting "old age pensions," awaited all British workmen, has gone over to the Philistines. It may be asked what is a Philistine? The term comes from a Hebrew word, signifying to wander about, and therefore fits, like a glove, the individual who has been Radical, Liberal, peace advocate, Unionist, and ultra Tory in turn; who, having passed through every phase of entomological development, from egg to grub and grub to chrysalis, has reached the final stage of the imago and been metamorphosed into a blood and thunder Jingo, whose first act is to "cry havoc and let slip the dogs of war." Yes, he who but lately cooed, as softly as a sucking dove, over the peaceful disposition of the Boers and their inherited love of freedom, now screams, like a king vulture ravening for his prey, for their total extinction.

The most ancient of all the gods in the heathen mythology was Janus, a deity represented with two faces, so that he could see both ways at one and the same time—a very useful arrangement under certain conditions, though by no means beautiful from an æsthetic point of view:

"Yet was not Joseph thus by Nature sent
To lead the guilty guilts worst instrument?
His soul was changed before his deeds had driven
Him forth to war with man and forfeit Heaven."

If his biographers speak truth, he was, in his early days, a very good young man, who taught Sunday-school in his native town, instructing in the doctrines of Christianity the young folk of Birmingham, whose week-days were devoted, it is said, to the manufacture, amongst other nick-nackeries, of metal idols for sale to the savages of South Africa and other heathen countries, visited by England with a sword in her right hand, a Bible in her left, and a pedlar's pack upon her shoulders containing the aforesaid nick-nackeries, metal idols included.

The massacres, the farm-burnings, the destruction of growing crops and grain, the wrecking of mills and breaking of mill-stones, the tortures of the so-called concentration and refuge camps, the bodily and mental sufferings of the victims of British brutality have filled the cup of England's iniquity to overflowing. The hecatomb of horror cries to heaven for vengeance upon those who are responsible for the guilt of it all. Upon whom does the responsibility rest? The English people, with many honourable exceptions, say upon the Boers, who they declare were the aggressors. But were they the aggressors? How could they, under any possible circumstances, come into collision with England save as defenders of their own country from invasion? If the whole population of the Transvaal could cross the six thousand miles of ocean and make

a descent upon England—an absurd proposition—they would be wiped out of existence in an hour; and this is the nation arraigned at the bar of eternal justice for making war upon Great Britain. So far from the Boers being the aggressors, it has been proved to demonstration that the Colonial Secretary, with consummate Machiavellian craft, led them into a trap, and forced them in self-defence to strike the first blow, so that he might be in a position to declare before the world that England was only acting on the defensive and has had right upon her side from the first. The beautiful allegory of the wolf and the lamb illustrates in minutest detail what actually took place. The illustration may be thought *jejune* and hackneyed, but I am tempted to introduce the familiar story, it is so relevant, and because these old-world instances are pregnant with wisdom and enlightenment.

The wolf, who was drinking at the stream above, accused the lamb, who was drinking lower down, of muddying the water, and when the lamb explained that such could not possibly be the case, as the stream flowed downwards from where the wolf was drinking, the savage beast flew into a rage, declared the lamb's statement a lie, accused this lamb in particular and all lambs and sheep in general of various high crimes and misdemeanours, especially the crime of wolf-hating, and thereupon attacked the little lamb and tore it in pieces.

The history of what brought on the war, though a long and sensational one, can be compressed into a very small compass without detracting from the damning character of the evidence against the British Government.

The Dutch were the first to colonise South Africa, having bought the land upon which they settled from a Hottentot chief for a large sum of money. This became the site of Cape Town of the present day. In 1793 the English took possession of the colony, and then the troubles began. They kept hustling the Boers all over the place for many years, and finally robbed them of their legitimate rights and drove them to wander away, or trek, in search of new homes. The great trek of 1836 was intended to sever all relations between the British and the Boers, the sole aim of the Dutchmen being to find a country in which to form a new settlement beyond the wilderness and far beyond the limits of British territory, so as to be rid for ever of the odious British rule. It is not necessary to enter into events that happened subsequently until we come to the Sand River Treaty of January 17, 1852, made between England and the Transvaal, and which guaranteed to the Boers their national independence absolutely and for all time. I have the text before me. It is unnecessary to quote the document in full. The following brief extract is sufficient to indicate the nature of the solemn treaty entered into on that occasion :

"The Assistant Commissioners guarantee in the fullest manner, on the part of the British Government, to the emigrant farmers beyond the Vaal River the right to manage their own affairs and to govern themselves according to their own laws, without any interference on the part of the British Government, and that no encroachment shall be made on the territory beyond, to the north of the Vaal River."

A considerable period of peace and prosperity followed upon the completion of the Sand River Treaty. But the evil spirit and treacherous diplomacy of English officials kept dogging the steps of the Boers wherever they went, ever on the watch for a pretext to carry out the settled policy of piracy and grab; the English political agents being the pioneers and executants of the Government policy. The brazen perfidy of the performers in those "trick of the loop" transactions can be called nothing else than downright blackguardism. England, in her piratical expeditions, whether in Europe, Asia, Africa, or America, has always professed her great love for the human race, going on the broad principle of an earnest desire to promote the general welfare of mankind. This is sheer hypocrisy; her love for other peoples is the love of the tiger and the shark for their prey. Take the condition of the subject races. Wherever the British flag floats they are kept down with a hand of iron, taxed to the uttermost farthing, and compelled by the harshest means to pay out of their extreme poverty for the privilege of living under British rule. The recurrent famines and plagues in India are said to be directly traceable to the fact that over-taxation for Government purposes disables the natives from making provision against bad times. People who could live upon twopence a day, if they had even that, to purchase a handful of rice and a pinch of salt, are left to die of hunger while their English rulers are living at ease surrounded by every luxury. Even the wretched black men in various parts of Africa, under the blessings of English government, are compelled to pay a "hut tax" for the miserable shanties they build to shelter them from sun and storm. John Bull is too much given to patting himself on the back and posing as the possessor of all the virtues, praising God that he is not like other men, while at the same time he is engaged in slaying and oppressing his fellow-creatures wherever he goes. Mr. Gladstone did not hesitate to show up his Pharisaism when he wrote (in the *Nineteenth Century Review*, July 1889), "Englishmen have been comfortably ensconced in a belief of their own habitual moderation and humanity past as well as present." Twenty-five years after the Sand River Treaty, which barred for ever the interference of England in the affairs of the Boers, the wolf appears upon the scene, in the person of the redoubtable Sir Theophilus Shepstone, her Majesty's Special Commissioner, who is received by the Transvaal Government in a very friendly manner. His ostensible busi-

ness was to inquire into complaints made by certain British subjects against the Boer Government, but it instantly became evident that this honest gentleman's intentions or instructions went very much further, and that it had been predetermined to annex the Transvaal. Having made the necessary arrangements, by massing an army on the Natal frontier, and with a Zulu army of reserve ready to hand, Sir Theophilus Shepstone threw off the mask, and issued the following manifesto to President Burgers :

"PRETORIA, April 9, 1877.

"SIR,—When, with several gentlemen of my staff, I met your Honour on Saturday last, you requested me to communicate to you in writing what I had then and previously on various occasions explained to you verbally—namely, that, looking at the condition of the country, the weakness of the Government, and the position of danger to which the circumstances surrounding the State expose, not only the State itself, but also her Majesty's subjects and possessions in South Africa, and further looking to the fact that the inherent weakness of the State is such as to preclude all hope of its recovering its prestige with the native races or the confidence of European communities, and that therefore these distressing conditions must become daily worse, and speedily produce anarchy and dissolution, I was convinced that no other remedy could be applied to save it and South Africa from the gravest consequences, except the extension over the Transvaal of her Majesty's authority and rule. I am therefore compelled to tell you that I see no way out of the difficulties of the Transvaal, which are at this moment practically the serious difficulties of South Africa, except by adopting, as soon as possible, the measures I have above described.

"(Signed) T. SHEPSTONE,

"Her Majesty's Special Commissioner."

On receiving this manifesto President Burgers at once issued a strong protest, concluding with the words :

"I do hereby in the name of and by authority of the Government and the people of the South African Republic solemnly protest against the intended annexation."

The Executive Committee of the Republic met immediately and resolved at once to despatch a deputation to London with a firm remonstrance against the proposed act of aggression, pointing out that

"The Government of the South African Republic is not aware of ever having given any reason for a hostile act on the part of her Majesty's Government, nor any ground for an act of violence,"

but

"has ever shown its readiness, and is still prepared to do all which in justice and equity may be demanded, and also to remove all causes of dissatisfaction that may exist."

In short, the Transvaal Government exhausted all the resources

of diplomacy, carrying concession to the verge of foolishness, to avoid bloodshed and disorder; and finally it resolved to submit temporarily, under protest, to the unjust action of the British Government, at the same time a deputation, consisting of the Vice-President of the Republic, Mr. Kruger, and Dr. Jorissen, State Attorney, was sent to represent the state of affairs to the British Government. The deputation reached London at the end of June 1877 and laid the case before Lord Carnarvon, the then Colonial Secretary, who told them bluntly

"I should only be misleading you if I were to hold out to you the slightest expectation that the policy which has been adopted [that is to say, the policy of the Pirate Empire] could now be altered, or that the annexation of the Transvaal could be undone."

And now a word as to the false pretences upon which the attempt has been made to destroy the national life of the Transvaal. Sir Theophilus Shepstone, about whose qualifications as a past master of grabbers I will have something to say presently, put forward in his manifesto of April 9, 1877, "the inherent weakness of the State" as the principal reason for annexing it to the British Empire—a manifest lie. The next lie is that "the great majority of the Boers approved of the annexation, a fractional minority only opposing it." These pretences are as false as ever emanated from the father of lies himself. The action of the Boers in the field, and of the Boer Government in Council, give the lie direct to both charges. A more powerful fighting force for its numbers or more united State than the Transvaal never existed upon earth, as shown by the tremendous stand they have made and still are making against overwhelming numbers. Reference is made above to Sir Theophilus Shepstone as a past master of grabbers, and therefore a fitting agent in carrying out the felonious designs of the English Government on the Transvaal. In the correspondence of Lord Welby, on behalf of the Treasury, and the Secretary for the Colonies, the miserable petty peculation shown is something incredible. Regarding Sir Theophilus Shepstone's financial account, Sir Reginald (now Lord) Welby writes on April 17, 1883:

"The account is of a most unsatisfactory character, vouchers and details are produced for about one-third only of the payments, and the small portion that is capable of thorough examination contains evidence that the unvouched residue includes several duplicate charges. One item, described as forage, contained a concertina, a set of vases, a great coat, and some muslin."

The then Secretary for the Colonies made an appeal *ad misericordiam* to the Treasury on behalf of his subordinate. The following is an extract from the reply of Mr. Leonard Courtney, then Secretary to the Treasury, dated October 16, 1884:

"A charge for forage which includes a concertina, a great coat, and a set of vases is simply an impertinence on the part of the accountant, and my Lords feel sure the Secretary of State will not wish them to charge the consolidated fund with the cost of Sir Theophilus Shepstone's bat, Mr. H. C. Shepstone's hair-brushes, Mr. Finney's cricket-bat, or Mr. Thirsk's fishing-rod."

Sir Theophilus Shepstone's manifesto of April 9, 1877, addressed to the President, intimating his resolve to deprive the Transvaal of its independence, began pompously as follows: "*When with several gentlemen of my staff I met your Honour.*"

The *gentlemen of the staff* were the accomplices of Sir Theophilus Shepstone in this barefaced act of brigandage. Merciful heaven! to think of a noble nation like the Boers subjected to war, pestilence, famine, and all their attendant evils, that such miscreants as Sir Theophilus Shepstone and his staff of gentlemen, relying on the complacency of the Home Government, might be in a position to pick the pockets of the British public.

Attention was drawn just now to the silence of the clergy on the subject of South Africa. It may perhaps be said that the war craze has got such a hold on the minds of the people that no minister of any Protestant Church, unless he is a man of iron nerve and tender conscience, dare speak against the war from the pulpit. This may be so, but there is a privileged place where the dignitaries of the Church can speak out if they are so minded. Why do they not do so? There are many venerable upright and learned men on the bench of bishops in the House of Lords whose silence must naturally be interpreted by their lay colleagues as a tacit approval of the work that is going on in South Africa. Are they willing to be thought aiders and abettors of crime? Do they approve of it, and if not, why do they not testify in favour of righteousness and peace?

To judge by results it would appear that English statesmen, with rare exceptions, never consider the ethical side of the question, and it is high time for them to begin. They would find in the celebrated work of the late Henry Sidgwick, Knightbridge Professor of Moral Philosophy in Cambridge University, on *Practical Ethics*, ample food for reflection. It is highly probable they would be obliged to recognise themselves as the "unscrupulous statesmen" who have "made wars that were substantially acts of conscious brigandage," and have been "applauded for so doing by the nations whom they led, who have suffered a temporary obscurity of their moral sense under the influence of national ambition." Professor Sidgwick, who wrote a considerable time before the Jameson Raid, seems to have had a foreknowledge of what was about to happen. "Coming events cast their shadows before," and the shadow cast upon the Transvaal was black and terrible beyond conception as subsequent events have proved. Anyhow, although Professor Sidgwick was generalising, his words appear to have a special applica-

bility to the Boer War, the action of the Colonial Secretary in regard to it, and to the obscuration of the moral sense of the people of England on the subject. But to cite Professor Sidgwick again: "The Immorality of such unscrupulous aggression is simple, and the duty is no less clear for any individual in the aggressing country to use any moral and intellectual influence he may possess—*facing unpopularity*—to prevent the immoral act." I now come to the most remarkable of Professor Sidgwick's utterances, most remarkable for the reason that with singular prescience, still of course generalising, he mirrors forth with startling effect what actually took place—in other words, how the Boers were drawn into the war:

"Let us place ourselves," he says, "at the point of view of a nation that is being drawn into what it regards as a just war according to the received principles of international justice. . . . War is not only obviously just against actual aggression, but when aggression is unmistakably being prepared the nation threatened cannot be condemned for striking the first blow, if this is an important gain for self-defence."

I have in former articles pointed out the fraudulent use made of the so-called Outlander grievances, and various other false pretences, to mask the deliberate resolve of the British Government to grab the Transvaal. Eventually diamonds were discovered in the two Republics; the usual rush of English diggers took place, and in 1871 the annexation of the diamond fields was effected, an act of robbery which Mr. Froude calls "perhaps the most discreditable incident in British colonial history."

On January 21, 1881, there was a big debate in the House of Commons on the question of the annexation of the Transvaal. There is always a full-dress debate in the House when anything particularly shameful has been done, for the reason that there are always some respectable men in Parliament who object to aiding or abetting the Government in its dirty work. The late Mr. Rylands, Member for Burnley, moved:

"That this House is of opinion that the annexation of the Transvaal was impolitic and unjustifiable, and would view with regret any measure taken by her Majesty's Government with the object of enforcing English supremacy on the people of the Transvaal who rightly claim their national independence."

The issue is here put plainly by an honest Englishman; Mr. Cartwright, Member for Oxfordshire, seconded the motion. Nothing could be fairer or stronger than the terms in which mover and seconder spoke in condemnation of the act of annexation. Now, by whom was the motion opposed and in what interest? It was opposed by two London bankers in the interests of Mammon worshippers, *et hoc genus omne*—by Sir John Lubbock, Bart., Lombard Street, Member for London University, a great authority on hymenopterous insects of the genus *formica*, and by Mr. R. N. Fowler, also

a London banker, hailing from Cornhill. The mere mention of the fact is sufficient to indicate the nature of the opposition and its source. The motion was defeated. The gold interest won; then came the retrocession of 1881, the rearrangement of 1884, the recognition of the autonomy of the Transvaal, and the dropping of the claim of suzerainty. But Majuba had to be avenged; the conspirators were still at work. A bogus insurrection hatched in Johannesburg resulted in the miserable *fiasco* of the Jameson Raid. Then came more plotting and more conspiring. All the artifices of the juggler, the impostor, and the cheat were practised to induce the Boers to give up their independence and come under British rule. But all the tricks and stratagems of Chamberlain, Milner, Rhodes and Co. were met bravely and resolutely with a determined *non possumus*. Finally, the brave President, the undaunted Paul Kruger, was called upon by Chamberlain to "Stand and deliver"; whereupon the Dick Turpin of the affair is treated to a fight the like of which the world never saw before, nor is it likely ever to see again—a fight that was not expected and is not yet over.

Before concluding I desire to refer to the testimony of a distinguished and disinterested Englishman, an impartial witness, as to facts within his own knowledge. Any person who wishes to verify the citations can refer to the *London Times*, October 24 and 31, 1899. I allude to the letters of Mr. F. C. Selous, the celebrated traveller and hunter, who lived for twenty years amongst the Boers. He was there at the time of the Jameson Raid. My recollection is that the conspirators attempted to implicate him in the Raid, either before or after the event, and that he withdrew from the country and returned to England to avoid taking any part *pro* or *con* on the occasion. In reply to charges against the Boers, he says:

"I have never met with anything but hospitality and kindness, and naturally at the present moment, when I firmly believe that there is a design in certain quarters to force a war upon them which it will be made to appear that they have forced upon us. I feel a great deal of sympathy with them."

Mr. Selous proceeds:

"As for the Boers having a contempt for Englishmen as individuals, that is nonsense. They hate the British Government, and, knowing their history, I for one think they have ample reason for doing so; but the individual Englishmen that they know they take at his real value."

I conclude this article with an aspiration few Englishmen will venture to join in. May God defend the right!

W. J. CORBET.

THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL'S ACCUSATIONS AGAINST THE BOERS EXAMINED.

"The sense of a good, that is, speaking generally, a defensive cause, of fighting for hearth and home, of delivering no blow except in answer to one given, or intended and prepared, is not only a moral warrant, but a real and fertile source of military energy." - W. E. GLADSTONE, *Gleanings*, vol. iv. p. 212.

"The question is whether the Boers were justified in assuming that they were about to be attacked. If so, the invasion was a measure of legitimate defence." -- *Daily News*, July 20, 1901.

ALTHOUGH I dissent from most of the statements in the Bishop of Liverpool's letter to the Swiss clergy, who appealed to British Christians to stop the present war in South Africa, yet I must admit that thanks are due to him for presenting in so compendious a form the case for subjugating and annexing the devastated territories of the Boer Republics.

The pleas used and the accusations made by the Bishop have been so much circulated during the last two years in the pro-subjugationist press, and are now so widely accepted among all classes of the community, that it has become almost imperative in the interests of truth alone, to say nothing of those of justice, to submit them to a searching examination, in order, if possible, to determine the exact degree of accuracy or inaccuracy attaching to them. Before, however, coming to close quarters with them, it is, I think, desirable for me to state as clearly and briefly as possible what my own position is with regard to the subject to which they relate.

Rightly or wrongly, I hold that the attempt on the part of the British Government to destroy the independence of the two Dutch Republics is a deliberate violation of the golden rule to do unto others as we think others, in similar circumstances, ought to do unto us. I am convinced that if the Boers were in the position of the British, and the British in that of the Boers, the British would think their enemies were doing wrong in seeking to destroy for others what they so highly value for themselves. If this is pro-Boerism I plead guilty to the charge. It seems to me, however, that such a position is an absolutely impartial one. It has, I humbly conceive, nothing whatever to do with special preferences for this nationality or the

other nationality. That it seems at present to make for the advantage of the Boers is a mere accident of its application. The day may not be far distant when the British will be glad to avail themselves of it without being able to do so. Correctly described, my position is no more pro-Boer than pro-British. It is based upon a dictum, not only of Christianity, but of the reason which was before Christianity, and which would remain if Christianity ceased to be. It is based upon a law binding equally on all mankind, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether Boers or Britons. In that law there is no recognition of any distinction between Christians and non-Christians. It commands all men simply and solely in virtue of their nationality, and quite irrespective of the particular religions to which they may or may not assent. It commands men simply and solely as men. By it, and not by their religious beliefs or non-beliefs, are they judged. Not he that crieth "Lord, Lord," but he that obeys the moral law of the Eternal is the man to whom alone can apply the words: "Well done thou good and faithful servant: enter now into the knowledge and love of God, which is joy without end."

Whether it benefits Boer or Briton, whoever it benefits or whoever it injures, I trust that the outcome of this struggle for freedom and for independence will be the triumph of right, and the overthrow, utter and complete, of wrong. This sentiment, no doubt, Dr. Chavasse will heartily reciprocate, and the bulk of the British people will echo it in their hearts. I must give them credit for continuing the struggle because they honestly believe that the object for which they fight is a right object, and worthy of a great people. If this is so they will be able to understand the Boers whom they claim to be actuated by a similar conviction. The struggle in one form or another will go on until one of the two contending parties acknowledges itself in the wrong. The British profess to have placed their trust in God. The Boers profess to have done the same. We shall see to which side victory is ultimately given. On the Boer side there is no doubt as to the result. "We can't lose," said one of the Boer women whose husband was at St. Helena; "we can't lose; it would not be right. God would never allow it." "God will see us righted," said a Boer prisoner at St. Helena to Mrs. Green when she visited that island prison. And the manifesto which President Steyn issued to his burghers on the outbreak of the war concludes with these inspiring sentiments:

"Let us look forward with confidence to a successful issue of the struggle, trusting to that Higher Power without whose assistance human weapons avail nothing. To the God of our fathers we humbly commend the justice of our cause. May He defend the right, and may He bless our weapons. Under his banner we proceed to battle for freedom and for fatherland."¹

¹ *Times' History of the War in South Africa*, vol. i. p. 375.

This sublime faith has shown itself in deeds which prove that the spirit of the old days, when Greece withstood the Persian host, is still alive in the world, even in the hearts of those simple South African farmers who were to be so easily and so speedily crushed to earth so that they should never be able to rise again! Truly, it is a sight for gods and men! An empire of 50,000,000 putting forth its utmost available military strength to crush, *with the assistance of natives*, some 195,000 Boers,¹ and after two years of disaster and humiliation such as it has never had to endure even at the hands of great military powers, being as far as ever from breaking the unbreakable spirit against which it contends! This is a transaction that most assuredly will reflect no glory on the would-be subjugator and annexationist. In such a cause for such a selfish object, after so ignoble a struggle so inhumanely conducted at the expense of thousands of lives of helpless women and children, and with such overwhelming odds in his favour, victory for him will be no better than defeat, and equally with the latter will only serve to carry his name down to everlasting infamy. It will be said, and said truly, that for the sake of mere material gain for himself, or for the millionaires, who have used him as their cat's-paw, he has turned his back upon the teachings of the founder of his religion, in order that he may the more easily play the part of pirate and murderer on a large scale. It will be said, and said with perfect truth, that instead of being animated in this matter by the spirit of Christ, he has let himself become possessed with the demon that inspires the wretched war songs contributed to the Jingo Press and sung in the music halls; songs stuffed from beginning to end with appeals to just those very passions against which the founder of Christianity lifted his voice. For in truth if you take out of these wicked productions all their base appeals to national, or perhaps I ought *now* to say imperial vain-glory; to pride, to hatred, malice, and every form of uncharitableness and little-mindedness, there will be nothing of any moment left in them, and certainly nothing to gain them the admiration and applause which from little minds they so readily obtain.

Dr. Chavasse endeavours to dispose of the appeal of the Swiss clergy by taking three distinct lines of argument. The first relates to the origin of the war, the second to farm burning, and the third to the concentration of Boer women and children in the death traps called refuge camps. I shall only be able in this article to examine the first, which runs as follows:

"(1) We did not seek the war. It was forced upon us by men who, whatever may have been their pretext, really aimed, as is now beyond doubt, at the overthrow of British power in South Africa and at the setting up of a South African Republic. They deliberately invaded British territory and publicly annexed it."

¹ *The War against the Dutch Republics in South Africa.* By H. J. Ogden. P. 9.

Perhaps the best way of dealing with the first statement in this quotation is to ask the question it so naturally suggests: What, then, did you seek? You violated the clearly expressed provisions of the Convention of 1884, by interfering in the internal affairs of the Transvaal, and backing up your interference with threats¹ and a display of armed force. You must have had some reason for doing this. What was that reason? Did you dream that, by means of bluff, you would be able to bring the Boers to such a state of abject fear that they would for ever afterwards submit to all your illegal demands, to the number of which, apparently, there was no limit whatever? If so, you made as bad a calculation of the character of the Boers as you made of the military strength required to crush them. Still, I will not venture to say that something of this kind may not have been present in your mind. Of course you did not seek war if you could get what you wanted without it. A gentleman of the road does not seek to kill his victim if he can get his money without killing him. The only important thing for him is that he shall get the money; by peaceable threats, accompanied by a peaceable display of arms, if possible; but by the putting of such threats into execution if necessary; only in any case the money must be got.

The theory of bluff appears to have been accepted by a prominent politician. Speaking in the House of Commons on February 2, 1900, Mr. Bryn Roberts said:

"I will tell the House what was the real cause of it [the war]. It may be summed up in one word, 'Bluff—Bluff!' I am perfectly certain that the country never intended to go to war on account of these grievances [lack of the franchise, &c.]. We were assured by the Cape press² that we

¹ As examples of threats, take those of Mr. Chamberlain's Highbury speech, wherein he compares President Kruger to a squeezed sponge, and threatens that if the diplomatic knot is not unloosed "other means" will have to be taken to unloose it. He also talks of the sands in the hour-glass running out, and uses other God-Almighty-to-a-black-beetle language which he would not have dared to use if a great European Power had been in the case. At a period much earlier than the date of the Highbury speech he had shown what his intention was. Within three weeks after the Raid Mr. Chamberlain sent a cable to Sir H. Robinson, the High Commissioner, described by the latter as "intimating that he was considering, in concert with his colleagues, the propriety of immediately sending large force, including cavalry and artillery, to the Cape, to provide for all eventualities" (c. 8063). Sir H. Robinson replied, "deprecating the proposed despatch of large force," and it was abandoned. But as early as January 4 Mr. Chamberlain wrote, in a despatch to Sir H. Robinson, the following threat against the Transvaal Government: "The danger from which they have just escaped was real, and one which, if the causes that led up to it are not removed, may recur, though in a different form" (*The War against the Dutch Republics*, by H. J. Ogden, page 21). Yet he could use different language when it suited him. Writing in the same month to President Kruger, when the President had the lives of the captured British raiders in his hands, Mr. Chamberlain said: "For myself, I have always felt confidence in your magnanimity." Mr. C. Greene, British Agent at Pretoria, also threatened the Boers with war. According to his statement in his telegram of August 15, he told their State-Attorney "that her Majesty's Government, who had given pledges to the Uitlanders, would be bound to assert their demands, and, if necessary, to press them by force" (Blue Book, c. 9521, p. 45).

² "There was not the slightest chance of war. Kruger must give way as he did on the last occasion [over the Drifts]. He (Mr. Rhodes) would leave the question now, because it was only the temporary trouble in South Africa." (From a speech made by Mr. Rhodes on August 14, 1899). On another occasion Mr. Rhodes said: "The armed strength of the Boers is the greatest unpricked bubble in the world. Kruger

had only to be firm in our attitude, and point our cannon at President Kruger, and he would climb down. We were told that it was only necessary for us to be firm to secure acquiescence; and I am afraid I cannot acquit the Liberal party from some share of blame in the matter."

Possibly the Liberal party was only bluffed when told that bluff would get what was wanted without war. But what conclusion were the Boers warranted in drawing? Between June and October they saw the British garrison in South Africa jump from 10,000 to 24,700 men. When they remonstrated they were told that the troops were there not only for defence but for "eventualities"! On October 7 an additional force of 48,000 men was called out for active service in South Africa. At the same time the British Government, having refused the five-years franchise on the very reasonable conditions attached to it,¹ and still withholding the

will bluster and bluff, and bully, but it will take a great deal to make him fight." It took the calling out of the British Reserves. Then a bubble was indeed pricked, the bubble of military prestige that had hitherto been enjoyed by the British Empire.

¹ These conditions were: (1) That the British Government should offer no further interference with the internal affairs of the Transvaal, except such as might be warranted by the Convention of 1881, or by international law. (2) That the Government should drop the assertion of suzerainty, which was dropped in 1881, and which they had no right to have revived. (3) That other questions in dispute should be submitted to arbitration. The five-years franchise, accompanied with these conditions, was offered on August 19. Mr. Chamberlain has affirmed that he sent "a qualified acceptance" of the Boer proposals. Whether he did so or not may be best judged from the following dialogue, which took place between him and Sir Edward Clarke in the House of Commons on October 19, 1899. In the course of a speech of that date, Sir E. Clarke said:

"The extraordinary incident that has marked the proceedings of this evening has been the statement of the Colonial Secretary that the answer to that proposal [of the five-years franchise] might be taken as an acceptance. I should like to know, was that answer intended as an acceptance?"

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: At that time we thought the proposals of the Transvaal extremely promising. We intended to send a most conciliatory answer accepting, as far as it was humanely possible, their proposal, and, as the only point of difference was the internal intervention, I thought myself it would be accepted."

"SIR E. CLARKE: Then I take it that it was intended to be an acceptance. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that were so—if, in fact, the Colonial Secretary intended to accept the proposals of the Transvaal, then undoubtedly this amendment is proved up to the hilt."

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: The hon. member harps upon the word 'acceptance.' He must remember he asked me the question whether we intended to accept. I myself should have thought that the Boers would have taken it as an acceptance. But I suppose it may be properly described as a qualified acceptance. We did not accept everything, but we accepted at least nine-tenths of the whole."

"SIR E. CLARKE: Really this becomes more and more sad. It is dreadful to think of a country of this kind entering upon a war, a crime against civilisation, when this sort of thing has been going on. Why, in the very next sentence [i.e., of the despatch of September 8] the right hon. gentleman says: 'It is on this ground that her Majesty's Government have been compelled to regard the last proposal of the Government of the South African Republic as unacceptable in the form in which it has been presented.'"

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: In the form."

"SIR E. CLARKE: Is it a matter of form?"

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Yes."

On October 25, in the House of Commons, Mr. Courtney referred to these statements, and Mr. Chamberlain replied.

"MR. COURTNEY: The next point is the rights of the Outlanders, and here we have got a five-years franchise promised; at first seven years, and then five years, subject to conditions, to which my right hon. friend sent an answer intended to be received as an acceptance. (An hon. member dissented.) My right hon. friend is quite equal to denying my statement if it is wrong."

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Oh, well, then I do deny it. I did not think it worth while to interrupt my hon. friend, because he knows I have said over and over again a 'qualified' acceptance, and he always omits the adjective."

proposals for a final settlement which it had promised to send, gave every warrant for the conclusion that nothing less than an abject submission on the part of the Boers to every demand it might think fit to make, would save them from an invasion to enforce those demands at the point of the bayonet. To the Boers this could mean nothing less than the offering of a choice between losing their independence and fighting for it. For when a state has to submit under threat of compulsion to every demand made upon it, that state is no longer independent even in its internal affairs.

This was the position immediately before the ultimatum was sent. The Boers were waiting for the proposals which were to constitute a final settlement of the dispute, and which they were told, once on September 25, and once again on a subsequent date,¹ would shortly be made to them. But instead of these proposals being sent, they were held back while 48,000 men were got ready for active service in South Africa. Why were these 48,000 men ordered out? Were they to be marched to the enemy's borders and home again without firing a shot? Were they merely to be sent as an additional force to defend the colonies? But the safety of the colonies was already ensured according to the judgment of the Government's military advisers. To this fact we have the testimony of Lord Lansdowne. Speaking in the House of Lords on March 15, 1901, the head of the War Office said: "We believed that the country was not ready for war in the months of June and July 1899, and we therefore contented ourselves with taking those measures we were advised were sufficient to insure the safety of the colonies in the meantime." And on August 16, 1899, the *Times* had said:

"The regular troops at present in South Africa, together with the irregular levies at the disposal of the authorities, would be fully equal to cope with any force the Boers could put into the field."

Thus although all measures believed to be needful for the defence of the colonies had confessedly been taken, yet still the situation in this country continued to grow more and more threatening.

The *Daily Graphic* for September 28 deals with "War Preparations," "Sailing of Artillery Troopships," "Extensive Purchase of Horses and Mules in America." After asking "Is Peace Possible?" the writer of the leading article in the same issue goes on to say that "the Cabinet will meet to-morrow to draw up what will virtually be an ultimatum to the Transvaal." After the war had

"MR. COURTNEY: You said nine-tenths. Is the one-tenth worth war? Tell us what the one-tenth is.

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think it was worth war.

"MR. COURTNEY: Tell us what the one-tenth is.

"MR. CHAMBERLAIN: Why did not President Kruger give way?

"MR. COURTNEY: Because he did not understand the despatch: it was never explained to him. Are we going to fight for the tenth point? As to that, Mr. Speaker, history, I think, will judge."

¹ See the Boer Ultimatum.

commenced, Sir William Harcourt, in the House of Commons, wanted to see the proposals of that ultimatum. "I dare say the right hon. gentleman does," was Mr. Chamberlain's reply, "but that want will never be gratified. That ultimatum is buried and is never likely to be raised again." Yet on October 25, 1899, Mr. Chamberlain, replying in the House of Commons to Mr. Courtney, asked: "Why did not President Kruger give way?" How the President could give way to demands which were held back, and of which he was not allowed to have any knowledge, it would, I think, be difficult even for Mr. Chamberlain to explain. History will brand this transaction as it deserves. You threaten a man that if he does not do what is required of him, you will take means to force him, and yet you do not let him know what is required of him, lest, by compliance, he should deprive you of any excuse for using the said means. And while you are treating him in this manner you expect him to wait quietly until sixty or seventy thousand armed men are massed near his frontiers. Well may you dislike the idea of arbitrating the whole question! You know that your case will not bear examination and *has not a leg to stand upon.*

Is there any country in the world which, having every reason for concluding that it is about to be invaded, would remain passive until about sixty or seventy thousand men were massed upon its borders, ready to strike a sudden blow at a moment's notice, or at no notice at all? In 1895 a British force had struck without previous notice. Was it to be reasonably expected that the Boers would wait for a repetition of that despicable act of treachery?¹ As a matter of fact, however, before he sent the ultimatum President Kruger did wait far beyond the time which could be reasonably expected.

As early as September 30 the organs of the Ministry announced that the Government had come to the decision to send an armed force to South Africa. When the attention of President Kruger was called to this fact, he said: "I do not care what the newspapers say, I look to the action of her Majesty's Government."²

Only when, after the royal proclamation of October 7, there was no longer any doubt about the matter, did the President take the final step which duty to his burghers imperatively dictated. Even then, if we are to accept the testimony of a writer in the *Times' History of the War*, who says he was in the field with the Boers during those last days of suspense: even then President Kruger only sent the ultimatum because his hand was forced by circumstances beyond his control. For on page 373 of the first volume of this work the writer says:

¹ The Jameson Raid. When begging for the lives of these men, Mr. Chamberlain said to President Kruger: "Your Honour may rest confident that I will always uphold all the obligations of the London Convention of 1884."

² Speech by Mr. Bryn Roberts in the House of Commons, February 2, 1900.

"No power on earth could any longer have averted war. If the Government had delayed many days longer the burghers, who were already beginning to grumble loudly against General Joubert's inaction, would have elected new generals of their own, and crossed the border without waiting for further formalities."¹

The Transvaal Government had not long to wait before finding that the instincts of the burghers had truth behind them. Having crossed the border, and having caused the British to retreat in confusion from Dundee, the Boers found ample evidence to confirm them in their conviction that their enemies were only waiting for a favourable opportunity to make an invasion previously determined on. A telegram sent from Glencoe by Reuter's correspondent with the Boers, on October 28, 1899, is here well in point :

"The papers captured," says this telegram, "at Dundee Camp from the British unveil a thoroughly worked-out scheme to attack the independence of both Republics as far back as 1896, notwithstanding constant assurances of amity towards the Free State. Among these papers there are portfolios of military sketches of various routes of invasion from Natal into the Transvaal and Free State, prepared by Major Grant, Captain Melville, and Captain Gale, immediately after the Jameson Raid. A further portfolio, marked secret, styled 'Reconnaissance Reports of Lines of Advance through the Free State,' was prepared by Captain Wooley, on the Intelligence Division of the War Office, in 1897, and is accompanied by a special memorandum, signed by Sir Redvers Buller, to keep it secret. Besides these there are specially executed maps of the Transvaal and Free State, showing all the natural features; also a further secret report of communications in Natal north of Ladysmith, including a memorandum of the road controlling Laing's Nek position. Further, there is a short military report on the Transvaal, printed in India in August last [1899] which was found most interesting. The white population is given as 288,000, of whom the Outlanders number 80,000, and, of the Outlanders, 30,000 are given as of British descent, which figures the authorities regard as much nearer the truth than Mr. Chamberlain's statements made in the House of Commons. One report estimates that 4000 Cape and Natal colonists would side with the Republics in case of war, and that the small armament of the Transvaal consists of 62,950 rifles, and that the Boers would prove not so mobile or such good marksmen as in the War of Independence."

A question here naturally suggests itself. Was Lord Lansdowne, head of the War Office, aware of these elaborate plans prepared by British officers with the knowledge of the War Office; and were they

¹ To substantiate the statement about the calling out of the Reserves, with the intention of using them to enforce upon Mr. Kruger the demands of a withheld and unknown British Ultimatum, the following extracts from the *London Times* of October 9, 1899, are appended: "*Transvaal Crisis*.—On Saturday two Royal Proclamations were issued—one directing the continuance in the army service, until discharged or transferred to the Reserve, of soldiers whose term of service has expired, or is about to expire; and the other ordering the Army Reserve to be called out on permanent service. . . . An order was issued from the War Office directing the immediate mobilisation of a field force for service in South Africa." Commenting on these threatening movements in the leading article of the same issue, a writer in the *Times* says: "The satisfaction expressed by the nation at the definite steps now taken by the Government to enforce, if necessary, their demands on Mr. Kruger can only be enhanced by a study of the actual situation in South Africa."

in his mind when, in June, he discussed with Lord Wolseley the wisdom of beginning operations as soon as possible, so as to "complete the subjugation of the two Republics by the month of November?"¹

Bearing upon the question of a British conspiracy to overthrow the Dutch Republics are the following statements which were made in *Chambers' Journal* for June 20, 1896, by Mr. H. A. Bryden, who, in the *Fortnightly Review* for August 1899, describes himself as an Imperialist and a Conservative, "with a personal knowledge of South Africa extending over three and twenty years." "There are, unfortunately, people of British blood who seem burning to force on a war between British and Dutch in South Africa. These people are few in number, but they have to be reckoned with. It may be well to remind them that in the Cape Colony the Dutch Afrikaners (or Boers), *who have for many years been loyal and contented subjects of the British Crown, far outnumber the British settlers.*" The italics are mine. While this Imperialist and Conservative writer bears testimony in support of a British conspiracy against the Republics, he tacitly denies that the Cape Colony Dutch have been guilty of anything of the same kind against the rule of Great Britain. In the issue of the *Fortnightly Review* above referred to Mr. Bryden also says:

"As for the policy of the extreme war party in this country, of abusing and maligning the Dutch Afrikaners of Cape Colony and their leaders—who, after all, have remained peaceful subjects of the Crown for close on a hundred years—it seems to be only too well calculated to drive them into that state of disaffection which, of all things, it is most necessary to avoid" ("British and Dutch in South Africa," *Fortnightly Review*, August 1899, page 196).

Instead of inquiry discovering a Dutch plot to overthrow British rule, it reveals a British plot to overthrow Dutch rule. Some of the public utterances of pro-subjugationists support this view. Referring to the object aimed at in South Africa by British Imperialists of the same stamp as himself, Lord Milner, just before he left Cape Town for his recent visit to England, said: "They have gone straight on the way upon which they were set from the first, namely, to make an end of this business once and for all—to make this one country under one flag." That Lord Milner was himself sent out with this express object, after the Jameson Raid, and the Government's apparent complicity in it, had made the British hold on South Africa weaker than it had been for a very long time, is shown by certain remarks made at a dinner given in his honour on Saturday, April 10, 1897, in the Hotel Metropole, immediately before his departure as High Commissioner for the Cape. "This country," said Mr. Goschen at the function just

¹ Lord Lansdowne's speech in the House of Lords, March 15, 1901, when he condemned Lord Wolseley for seeking to force the pace too quickly.

mentioned, "is determined to maintain its supremacy in these quarters and to back his Excellency, the High Commissioner, with the power of the British Empire." Sir Evelyn Wood "expressed the satisfaction with which he heard the declaration just made, that England, so far as one Cabinet Minister could lay it down, meant to be firm in maintaining its hold on South Africa" (*London Star*, April 12, 1897). These bellicose utterances were little thought of at the time of their delivery, but subsequent events have thrown a flood of light upon them. The real object of Lord Milner and his friends was well summed up by Dr. Leyds and Mr. Fischer in their interview with the special correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, at Brussels, on January 14, 1901: "Humble the South African Republics in the dust—if peacefully well and good; if with war, so much the worse; but humble them in any case."

"A Dutch conspiracy to injure the Empire," says the British Cain to deaden his guilty conscience. "A British conspiracy to overthrow the Dutch Republics," says *Truth*; and it will prevail in the end, along with those of us who have served it for its own sake and without material gain.

When driven from all their positions, the advocates of the theory of a great Dutch conspiracy take refuge in the question: Why did the Boers arm? This question may be easily answered. After being deprived of their independence in 1877 and treacherously invaded without declaration of war in 1895, the Boers would have failed to do their duty if they had not provided themselves against a recurrence of such events. In 1895 they were caught napping, and it was precisely because they were then known to be poorly off for arms that their cowardly enemies invaded them. The bulk of the arms which they had at the commencement of the war were of the very latest pattern, and have only been made within recent years. In the Report of the Boer armaments prepared by Sir J. C. Ardagh for the British Intelligence Department before the war commenced, the last statement is fully substantiated.

"Of the enormous quantity of rifles now," says Sir J. C. Ardagh, "in the possession of the South African Republic, only some 13,500 Martini-Henry rifles were in the country before the Jameson Raid. The whole of the remainder have been purchased since that date in England, France, Germany, and Belgium. This enormous stock of rifles would suffice to arm more than double the number of the whole forces of the Transvaal. . . . In January 1896 the strength of the Staats Artillery was nine officers and 100 men, though only 70 men were actually doing duty. Immediately after the Jameson Raid the corps was increased in strength to about 400, and in January last was stated by the Commandant-General to have an actual strength of 473 officers and men. This is exclusive of the Reserve, which, in the time of the Raid, amounted only to 50 men, but may now be estimated at 200 or 300 at least" (See pages 19, 21, and 27).

To the same effect is the evidence of Mr. Fitzpatrick, the *Times*,

Major White, Captain Younghusband, and Dr. Jameson himself. Limits of space forbid its reproduction here, but the reader will find it given in pages 22 and 23 of Mr. H. J. Ogden's excellent compilation called *The War against the Dutch Republics in South Africa*. Referring to the arming after the raid, Captain Younghusband says :

"One attempt had been made to take their country from them ; they were thoroughly convinced that the attempt would be renewed at some future time ; so the Boers were determined to be thoroughly on their guard the second time."

The more the question is examined the more clearly will this truth stand out, that the real blame for the actual outbreak of hostilities rests, not with those who struck the first blow, but with those who provoked them into striking it. When the security of a man's house is threatened, when loaded guns are pointed at it from an adjacent field, when he is practically told that if he does not do what is required of him they will be fired off, he is ethically warranted in telling those who have so placed such guns that if they do not immediately remove them he will march out and remove them himself, and if they refuse to heed his warning he is warranted in acting up to it. This is all that the Boers did. Having, in their ultimatum, given the British Government the opportunity of avoiding war by withdrawing its forces and accepting arbitration, they acted on the advantage they possessed in having all their forces on the spot and ready to strike before the whole of those belonging to the enemy could be landed. Considering that they were but as a mouse going forth to fight with an elephant, they were fully justified in acting as they did.

That the Boers desired to force a war upon Great Britain is flatly contradicted by their ultimatum, in which they give the British Government the chance of showing that it really aims at a peaceful settlement by accepting arbitration and at once withdrawing the forces then on the borders of the Republic. In refusing to discuss the terms of the ultimatum, the British Government clearly proved that peace was not its aim. The ultimatum merely compelled it to show itself in its true colours.

So much at present in reply to Dr. Chavasse's statement that the British Government and people, who, I suppose, are the "we" referred to, "did not seek the war." This statement is not, I venture to think, supported by the facts that preceded the war. But after making it the bishop goes on to make another which is, if possible, still less supported by facts. He once more repeats the oft-repeated but never substantiated charge of a great "Dutch conspiracy" to establish an independent Dutch Republic throughout South Africa. The realisation of this idea may be, and probably will be, one of the effects of the war ; but most assuredly the desire

to realise it was not the cause of the war. If the idea existed at all, it existed only as a noble aspiration to be left to time and the natural growth of Afrikaner population for realisation in the future. There was no need for a war to hurry it on. Peace was its best nurse. In her care it would grow slowly, steadily, surely. We must remember that the Dutch in South Africa are more virile than the British. They increase more rapidly. They fix themselves firmly on the soil, and grow there like strong and healthy plants in the light and air that God has given them, instead of following the fatal British practice of flocking to the exciting but unhealthy conditions of life in modern towns and cities. Instead of the British absorbing them they absorb the British, and at this very moment hundreds of English, Irish, and Scotch settlers are in arms against the king's forces, simply because, having married Boer women, they have found their interests identical with those of the land and people of their adoption, rather than with the fortune-hunting birds of passage who only come for all they can get, and clear off to another country as soon as they have got it. Facts like these will in course of time bring about a great, powerful, and independent South Africa. War to promote this end is not needed. War to prevent a jealous, envious, and avaricious British element from hindering it might be needed. But in any case it can only be the dream of a few enthusiasts. "I would challenge," says Mr. J. A. Hobson, who was sent out by the *Manchester Guardian* to get at the truth in regard to matters relating to the war :

"I would challenge the upholders of the 'Dutch conspiracy' hypothesis to produce any evidence from the speech or conduct of the leading statesmen of the Republics, or of the admitted leaders of the Afrikaner Bond, to prove the existence of any design to establish an independent Dutch Republic throughout South Africa. . . . No evidence exists that any responsible statesmen have ever seriously adopted this idea and moulded their policy upon it."¹

But there is evidence, and plenty of evidence, that if it existed at all as a driving force in practical politics, it must have been confined to a very few and very obscure individuals. The loyalty of the Cape Dutch before the war is a fact established on unimpeachable testimony. On September 7, 1899, Lord Loch, the late High Commissioner of South Africa, at a public dinner in London, said : "From personal experience I can say that the loyalty of the Dutch is beyond reproach." On July 24, 1899, Sir David Tennant, Speaker for twenty-four years in the Cape Assembly, and Agent-General for the Cape in London, speaking at the dinner of the London Chamber of Mines, said :

"The loyalty of the Cape is a quantity perfectly assured. . . . The Bond is perfectly loyal at heart ; its only feeling is anxiety for a solution

¹ *Contemporary Review*, January 1900, p. 11.

of the present difficulty with the Transvaal. . . . The little cables we see occasionally floating about are antagonistic to this view; but they are sent for party purposes and for financial objects. I extremely regret that those cables should influence to any extent the sensible people of England in forming an opinion adverse to the interests of the colony as a whole."

In the despatch which, on August 23, 1897, Lord Milner sent to Mr. Chamberlain on the occasion of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, there are these words:

"I have no doubt the same loyalty has been displayed in other parts of the Empire, but it appears to me to be of peculiar interest under the special circumstances of this colony, and in view of recent events [in connection with the Raid], which, as you are aware, have caused a feeling of considerable bitterness among different sections of the community. All that I can say is that, as far as I am able to judge, these racial differences have not affected the loyalty of any portion of the population to her Majesty the Queen. People of all races—the English, the Dutch, the Asiatics, as well as the African natives—have vied with one another in demonstrations of affection for her person and devotion to the Throne. It is impossible to doubt that the feeling of loyalty among all sections of the population is much stronger than has sometimes been believed."

The next witness is Dr. Theal, the well-known historian of South Africa. "I felt myself privileged," says the interviewer of the *Manchester Guardian*, "in meeting Dr. Theal the other day, and in being allowed to report what he thinks about the war." And then he gives an account of a long interview with the doctor. When the "great Dutch conspiracy" is being discussed, the interviewer interjects this question: "Not only the public, but the secret history of our own times must be known to you?" And Dr. Theal replies as follows:

"I have known the thoughts and aims of the Dutch for a long period. I say to you, on my word of honour, that I am as sure as I am sitting here that the design to oust the English from South Africa and set up a great Dutch Republic no more entered the minds of men like Kruger, Steyn, Reitz, Joubert, and Esselen than it has occurred to Premier Laurier to oust the United States from the American continent and make of all North America a great Canadian Dominion. Mr. Reitz, whom the British Press has so vilely slandered, is an esteemed friend of mine. I know, as a fact, that he has been more 'English,' as far as English rule in South Africa is concerned, than many Englishmen. Englishmen have talked of eliminating the Imperial factor, but not he. I have heard him again and again speak of the advantages derived from the protection of the British fleet. The Boer leaders are not angels, but they are men of common sense. What they have sought, what they seek, is that, while they respect the British authority outside the Republics, Great Britain shall respect Boer authority inside the Republics. They have never sought more, whatever anybody may say; they have never sought, and will not rest content with less."¹

Consider the following facts. Before the raid, the Cape Dutch and the Boers of the Orange Free State, believing President Kruger

¹ *Manchester Guardian*, March 5, 1900.

to be in the wrong over the closing of the drifts, were prepared to support England with arms and money in a war against the Transvaal, should such a war be required for getting the drifts opened. Fortunately it was not required: President Kruger gave way. After the raid both the Transvaal and the Orange Free State urged the Imperial Government to take over and directly control all the territory under the Chartered Company, whose irresponsible methods have caused so much bloodshed in South Africa. This did not look like desiring to overthrow British rule in that part of the world. In 1898 the Dutch Ministry voted an annual contribution of £30,000 to the Imperial navy. It also made over to the Imperial authorities the splendid naval station of Simon's Bay. Referring to this matter at the South African dinner, given in the Whitehall Rooms on May 18, 1899, Mr. Goschen said:

"When Mr. Schreiner, the present Prime Minister of the Cape Colony, proposed the vote of £30,000 a year as a contribution to naval expenditure, he uttered sentiments which must find an echo in the hearts of every lover of the community and the Empire. . . . The motion to grant £30,000 a year was carried unanimously. The Afrikaners were in power; the power had passed from Sir Gordon Sprigg; the Schreiner, the Bond party were at the helm, but it made no difference, and let the country understand that."

And he invited the other colonies to imitate "the patriotic example."

Lastly, when the British forces had been beaten at all points in December 1899, the Cape Dutch did not rise. This was their opportunity. Why did they not take it?

Even if all this evidence stood alone, it would be in itself quite strong enough to dispose of the conspiracy hypothesis. But it does not stand alone. Evidence of a social character strongly supports it. An incident occurred in connection with the farm burning which shows that the ideas prevailing among the Boers were not such as one would expect to find in a people animated by hatred of the British Empire, and bent upon destroying as much of it as existed in South Africa. Speaking to a representative of the *Cardiff Evening Express*, Major Wyndham-Quin, in giving an account of some of his experiences at the front, expressed himself as follows: "When farms are used as fortresses they should be destroyed, but not otherwise. It is the burning of the homestead without cause that I protest about. I well remember one sad occasion. In the eating-room of a house we had to destroy, there was a picture of the Princess of Wales on the wall. 'We have always been taught to regard her as a good woman,' said the vrow to me, 'and so we framed the picture and put it in the place of honour; but if this is the thing she countenances we don't believe it.' Whereupon she dragged the picture from its place and smashed it into a thousand pieces. It is this burning of farms and houses, and turning the women and children out on the veldt, which is doing us so much mischief. It is

not worthy of us, and at the first opportunity I shall raise my voice against it in another place."¹

Take another incident which throws a flood of light upon the real character of the Boers, and shows how far removed they were from being a nation of conspirators. Mr. Mortimer Menpes, in his *War Impressions*, speaks of the unshaken faith of the Boer women in the goodness of the late Queen Victoria, and the absolute conviction that she had no idea of what her soldiers were doing in South Africa. "I do think," said an old lady to Mr. Menpes, "I do think that some one ought to tell the Queen." A Boer girl told him how every night she prayed to God that He would send some one to the Queen to open her eyes and tell her she was being deceived. Facts like these display to us a simple-minded, inoffensive people, worthy of a better fate than that of extermination at the hands of the pirates of the North Sea. But this is now practically what is proposed to be done with them by the professed followers of the Prince of Peace. That such an act will go unavenged by Him to whom vengeance belongs, and who shall repay all their wrongs in full, is as impossible as that twice two can make five. This war is not merely a British mistake: it is a great British crime; and there is even in this world a power strong enough to bring the criminal to justice.

After accusing the Boers of forcing a war on our peace-loving country, and condemning them as conspirators, the Bishop of Liverpool repeats a charge that is very frequently made. He says that the Boers publicly annexed British territory. Is this true? Let us hear what the accused say. On November 17, 1899, Mr. Schreiner sent to President Steyn a protest against the reported annexation of Colonial territory. Two days later Mr. Steyn replied as follows:

"That deceit, misrepresentation, and lying which preceded and mainly caused the war, unjustly and cruelly proceeding against our will and in defiance of our rights, should not cease even now during the war, we quite expected, and we were not surprised, therefore, to notice the frequently repeated maliciously false charges against the Republic of atrocities, abuse of the white flag, and what not besides. But that you, who know the truth, should, as you apparently now do, give credence to such false reports and accusations, grieves and surprises me. . . . The portions of the colony occupied by our burgher forces have not been declared Free State territory."

On October 28 Lord Milner telegraphed to Mr. Chamberlain as follows:

"No copies of any proclamation by either Government to that effect [of annexation] have reached me here, but news coming from various parts of districts west and north of Kimberley clearly show(s) that the people here credit the annexation theory."

¹ *Morning Leader*, February 8, 1901.

So it was only a theory after all. The bishop, however, states it as if it were one of the most clearly established facts. The unfortunate thing is that in so stating it he gives support to a widely extended belief entertained by people who readily accept, without proof, whatever seems to belittle their enemy and put him in the wrong. In fact, the worse they can make him out to be the more do they rejoice; because by this means they manage to persuade themselves that they are doing a righteous thing in seeking to destroy his independence, and deprive him of the exercise of his national rights in the land of his fathers. If the Boers, either in the early stages of the war, or at any subsequent period, have annexed territory without having first obtained the consent of the people to whom it belongs, they have made the same mistake as the British, and have thus to this extent put themselves in the wrong. So far as they have done wrong, or are now doing wrong, by all means let them pay the just penalty for so doing; and let the British do the same. It is a matter for international arbitration. It is a matter for settlement by the assembled Powers at the Hague. One thing, however, the Boers are not doing. They are not seeking to deprive others of the independence which they desire for themselves. They are not sending ships and men 6000 miles to exterminate a small community whose only crime is that of loving freedom as much as the forefathers of their exterminators loved it. They are not professing Christ and practising Cain as this Empire is doing, to its heavy loss in power and reputation. The cause they fight for involves no subjection of one country to another country, or of one race to another race. They are only claiming for themselves what they are willing to allow to others; namely, the right as a people to govern themselves under that form of government which commends itself to their judgment, and with the assistance of those governors whom they freely choose. More than this they are not entitled to. Less than this they ought not to have. Until this is secured to them there will be no peace in South Africa.

M. D. O'BRIEN.

Postscript.—Nearly the whole of the foregoing was written a few days after the bishop's letter appeared in the press. Since then Lord Kitchener has used a plea for subjugation similar to that adopted by the bishop; and he caps it with a scriptural quotation to the effect that "they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." This seems to be intended to warn the defenders of independence that the process of extermination is soon to begin. Will the Powers of Europe and America remain passive while it is going on? Who can say? United for the one object, they are together well able to compel both sides to cease the game of murder

and submit all matters in dispute for final settlement by an international tribunal sitting at the Hague. In the case of England a collective stoppage of the food exportation might be enough without firing a shot. The Boers have already given their consent, and also expressed a desire to have the alleged Dutch conspiracy probed by such a tribunal to the bottom. The conspiracy connected with the Jameson Raid might be investigated at the same time. In fact, there might be a general clearing up. As to the taking of the sword, I wonder if the forces despatched to South Africa from India and the Mediterranean stations, months before the ultimatum, took swords or their equivalents with them? I wonder if it was intended that the already called out Reserves should take swords? Verily a certain person can quote Scripture to his purpose, only sometimes he appears to be troubled with a bad memory. An international tribunal might possibly refresh it for him. Such a tribunal might also take into account the active recruiting in August 1899 of Colonel Baden-Powell's force all over South Africa, on the false plea of dealing with possible trouble with the Matabele. See on this point, as well as on the alleged Dutch conspiracy, the contribution of Mr. F. C. Selous, the celebrated English sportsman, to the *Speaker*, and reproduced on page 207 of *The War against the Dutch Republics*. In regard to the alleged Dutch conspiracy, I conclude with the following words from the report of a speech delivered by Mr. Cronwright-Schreiner at the Memorial Hall, Manchester, before the Women's Liberal Association of that city:

"Mr. Cronwright-Schreiner went on to say that he thought if ever a people were deliberately maligned and misrepresented it was the Dutch of Cape Colony, amongst whom he had lived during the major portion of his life. Not only was the idea of a conspiracy amongst them a gross absurdity, but he would go further and say that so satisfied were they with their conditions under the Government of Cape Colony, which gave them all the freedom they could desire and the full power of their majority—so little did they like the Republican form of government in the Transvaal, that he said deliberately that if, without provocation, the Transvaal people had invaded Cape Colony with the idea of driving the British out and making it a Dutch colony, they would have been met by every burgher with his gun in his hand, who would have fought for Britain" (*Manchester Guardian*, May 8, 1900).

To give all the evidence that could be given against this Dutch conspiracy, or to give all that could be given in support of a British conspiracy, would require, not an article in a review, but as much time and attention as an international tribunal at the Hague could afford.

M. D. O'BRIEN.

SOUTH AFRICAN FINANCIAL REORGANISATION.

THERE are grave questions of finance in connection with the ultimate settlement in South Africa, no matter to which side we turn for light and leading, the right understanding of which as a basis for reorganisation is scarcely less vital to ourselves than to South Africa. The questions are non-political, and as a mere reflex of facts they should not provoke contention, although calculated to disturb the serenity of a powerful class whose every objection may, however, be as easily met as overcome by a sense of justice. They are indeed answered by reflection on Canadian and United States experience over a course of years; and so, therefore, the assertion may be hazarded in advance, that at the present time, and it may be for an indefinite future, British credit, unless now sustained by a utilisation of Consols, is to be sorely tried. The credit tensions already felt are various, and the exigencies of war threaten to aggravate them. For example, the export, which touched its highest point in 1872-3, and which has been sickly since, complains, that it is not only handicapped by the excessive gross profits of the banks, which in some cases are 40 per cent., but that its claims for accommodation are widely ignored by the banks, while those of the import trade are flattered and attended to. Rates are the impoverishing grievance of the producing and distributing classes, inasmuch as they long have been on the increase, and now, all round, they add one-third to rents already burdensome without them. Nor are the poor exempt from suffering through finance, which hits them in ground-rents, manufactured between landowner and builder, and by speculation in buildings at the auction mart, where any concocted ground-rent commands a ready buyer, and any building realises a price out of proportion to the cost of labour and material. In short, as frankly admitted by Mr. H. D. Macleod, the eminent barrister, in his lectures on "Credit and Banking," the banker is no longer, in the popular sense, a banker, as he has become a "manufacturer of credit," or of finance. Hence the domestic unrest incident to the occupation of rooms, often unattainable, while the demand ministers to the infatuation which will convert a time-honoured dust heap of one acre, of 250 ft. front, and 185 ft. back, into two rows of twelve

buildings, each with a roadway of 35 ft. between; each of the twenty-four ground-rents saleable at £6 6s. each, or "annually" by compound interest at 3 per cent. in seventy years, £1386 each; the 144 to 168 rooms letting at 4s. to 6s. each weekly, or the lot letting at from £1497 12s. to £2570 8s. annually. Moreover, each weekly rent of 4s. has a rateable value of £6, and each weekly rent of 6s. has a rateable value of £9 (Wandsworth and Clapham Union). Obviously the finance of low-class housing has converted the London poor into a veritable gold mine.

The tax on the export of coal, no doubt a necessity of the war, has only to be extended to the other articles of export to shut us out, as sellers, from the markets of the world, while continuing us as buyers in those markets, to the utter destruction of all the forms of British industry, although contemporaneously a South African Three per cent. loan of £100,000,000 to £500,000,000, when guaranteed by the revenues of the colonies, with the endorsement of the British Government, would probably be taken readily, as raw material for "futures," trusts, rings, promotions, syndicates, and credits, by the class who confound symbol with thing; whose assumed wealth abounds, and who are at a loss what to do with it: a melancholy evidence of falling back on the uninformed and retarding finance of the William III. and Pitt periods. Let a sentence or two serve for the consideration of the fateful finance of unused "Consols," so capable in itself to relieve present needs and burdens, although nothing hitherto has been done with it of consequence by any Government. Pitt and the Government of William III., blameless, in so far as the extraordinary finance of our day was hidden from them, took, unhappily for us, the narrowest conceivable view of a public debt, and oddly, to our shame, we cling to it as sacred, and not to be questioned, much less stigmatised. The view held then and still is that in placing one's money in the public debt or Consols, there is a breach of faith, whenever modifications in the terms are proposed—a contention in kind with our having to wear the fashions of our forefathers. Against the doctrine, Mr. Goschen, much to his credit, led a mild attack, holding, and giving effect to the declaration, that Consols, like other things, must submit to being brought into line with new conditions. Here, merely touching on the subject by taking a date which happens to be at hand, namely, April 6, 1793, long annuities were then quoted at £28 13s. 11½d., and short annuities at £11 15s. 6½d. per £100; and assuming both to have been subsequently converted into Three per cent. Consols at 60 it neither occurred to Pitt nor to the Government of William III. that in the long run the terms would work out oppressively; not to go back on the extreme three per cent. terms at 60, let illustration proceed on a modern three per cent. rate. Nominally, at the market price of the day, a man puts £100 in Three per cent. Consols; of course he might put his

money into something else with more profit, or even with possible loss, but in Consols he actively employs his £100, and in return receives an annual payment of £3. On that in twenty-four years he will to some extent have lived, and have got back the whole of his money. Thus he will have eaten his cake, but, strange to say, he still claims to possess it. Without reckoning interest on the £3 paid to him annually the £100 not employed will have to some extent served for thirty-three years to live upon, when it will give out. But the point at present is that at 3 per cent. compound interest money doubles itself in twenty-four years, and that what Pitt and the Government of William III lost sight of was, that when the interest on Consols equalled the principal, there should have been an approximately equitable provision, at an annually decreasing sum, for the extinction of the claim, say in a second twenty-four years. No such provision was made, and time and again, seemingly for ever, the principal sum of £100 has to be paid over and over again, to the moral wrong of the general public. To illustrate what should have been done, and what sooner than later must be done, is to take £100 as the true principal sum, disregarding market price fluctuations and the bygone prices of long and short annuities, and to divide the £100 by twenty-four years, when there should be a gradually slowing down deduction of say £1 to £5 annually. Ethically, no injustice would follow, but on the contrary justice would be done to the millions who are not holders of Consols. In round numbers, the eventual saving to the public would be £25,000,000 annually.

But it will be said that the extinction of the National Debt in twenty-four years, sooner or later, would in no degree influence South African reorganisation. The rejoinder is, that depends on the present use we may make of Consols, say on such lines of debt utilisation as those so successfully pursued by Canada and the United States. Indeed, on those lines the necessity for a £100,000,000 to £500,000,000 loan for South African reorganisation may be entirely obviated, and at the same time relief be afforded to the general public from a multitude of mere "chalk" oppressions of finance. But that is anticipation. What are Consols? And as the British Government hitherto has made no other than a peddling use of them, in its occasional money needs, there follows the further question, namely, the uses finance now makes of them? Answering the first question, Consols are a faith and sentiment born of a transcendental time, and are not a thing. They are an immaterial conception, objectified by imagination, notwithstanding the contention of Marie Correlli in her Edinburgh lecture on the decline of imagination. Why, with the South African war charge added to the present National Debt, imagination would be enormously extended. Consols are things of names, written in pen and ink on the pages of books at the Bank of England, as has been done, say, for

two centuries up to the present time, the dealings in them being by power of attorney, warranting the seller to have his name expunged from the books at the Bank of England and the name of the buyer substituted. Nothing could simplify the present process, nor improve its efficiency. Take a transaction for illustration. You desire to buy at the market price of the £100 in Three per cent. Consols. A broker, on a small commission, makes the purchase for you by buying from a dealer in Consols, who gives a power of attorney to the Bank of England to change his name for yours, in the matter of £100. You get no title to the abstract property, so you have nothing to show that you have made a purchase. But for your £100 you have acquired a right to sell £100 by power of attorney which will entitle you to replace your name by that of another. Obviously, a commissionaire, or a girl, might discharge the office, the former at £1 a week, the latter at 10s. when £200,000, more or less, annually would be saved to the public. The office is as easy as the posting of a letter, the absence of use of Consols by the British Government illustrating inaction, while the use of them by finance illustrates the contrary. To show the latter use a man or a corporation possessed of £100,000 in Consols, which is not an uncommon holding, gets 3 per cent. annually as dividend from the Bank of England, and without surrendering the dividend, he or they get a "credit" say of £90,000, at a bank, to be drawn on at convenience by cheque, giving the bank a temporary charge on the Consols. The arrangement may prove a double godsend, first to the individual, or the corporation, and second to the bank, by simply vitalising the £100,000 in Consols. First, there is the "credit." Next the bank may borrow from another bank £100,000 on the Consols. Or the bank may borrow £100,000 from a discount house. *Last, not to proceed further, the discount house may borrow £100,000 from its bank, the Consols going the rounds of a penny piece, creating "credits" at each turn, each "credit" available for drawing upon by cheque. A weak, analogous case would be that of a workman with £10 in pawn tickets trying it on for £10 in cash from the baker, the baker from the butcher, and the butcher from the milkman, each, by a little hocus-pocus, getting a ride of £10 for a month, or longer as arranged, the pawn tickets the "security" for the lot, all but the first raise of £10 mere "chalk."

Turn now, in the circumstances, for ourselves and South Africa to Canada and the United States. Canada is not tied down neck and heel to immemorial absurdities; its people are alive and, according to its lights, Canada utilises "credit" for the common good, with Xenophon and his finance ideals in view. In Mitford's *Greece*, Xenophon has these words attributed to him (vol. iv. p. 22): "The State to lend money to improve the harbour of Athens, to erect halls, exchanges, warehouses, market places, and inns. The

people to become one great banking company, every member of the community to obtain an easy livelihood."

The following official and hitherto unpublished statement, exclusively furnished, opens out the practical finance of Canada.

"The Government of Canada issues notes of the following denominations—\$1, \$2, \$3, \$4, \$50, \$100, \$500, \$1000, and \$5000 (1s., 8s., 12s., 16s., £10, £20, £100, £200, and £1000). The small notes are in the hands of the public and the others are entirely held by the various banks, which are obliged by law to hold not less than 40 per cent. of their cash reserves in Dominion notes (53 Vict. cap. 31, s. 50). We have offices in the following cities for the issue and redemption of Dominion notes, viz., in Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, St. John's, Victoria (British Columbia), Winnipeg, Charlotte Town (Prince Edward's Island), where they give gold for notes, or notes for gold, or one denomination of notes for others; but all these notes are first issued from the currency branch of the Finance Department from time to time, as required by the several Assistant Receivers-General.

"The circulation of Dominion notes on the 30th of September, 1900, amounted to \$27,500,860, as follows:

Fractional currency, 25 cents.	\$289,411-00
\$1 and \$2 notes	9,985,403-00
\$1 notes	370,987-00
\$5, \$10, and \$20 notes issued by the Province of Canada prior to Confederation	8,210-00
\$50 and \$100 notes	213,850-00
\$500, \$1000, and \$5000 notes	16,633,000-00
	<u>\$27,500,861-00</u>

"Up to the limit of \$20,000,000 we are compelled to keep 25 per cent. in specie and guaranteed sterling debentures, and 75 per cent. in unguaranteed debentures beyond the \$20,000,000; we must keep dollar for dollar in specie. The amount held by us on the 30th of September, 1900, was:

Specie (American and English gold)	\$13,861,810-00
Guaranteed sterling debentures, £400,000.	1,946,666-67
Unguaranteed debentures	17,250,000-00
	<u>\$33,058,476-67</u>
Excess of specie and guaranteed sterling debentures	\$3,307,612-00
Excess of unguaranteed debentures	2,250,000-00
Total excess	<u>\$5,557,612-00</u>

"The large notes are also used by the banks in settlement of their balances through the clearing-house. All Dominion notes are printed and engrossed in Ottawa, and the \$1, \$2, and \$3 notes are countersigned by a large staff of ladies in this branch. When notes are no longer fit for circulation they are redeemed by the several Assistant Receivers-General to forward to Ottawa and destroyed in a furnace.

"Canada has no gold coinage of its own, but both English and American gold are a legal tender, the sovereign being taken at \$4-86. Silver and copper are coined at the Royal Mint, England, for the Dominion

Government, namely, 5 cent, 25 cent, and 50 cent pieces, and the copper 1 cent.

"CANADIAN CURRENCY UNDER THE BANKS.

"Banks in Canada may issue and reissue notes payable to bearer on demand and intended for circulation; but no such notes shall be less than \$5, or for any sum that is not a multiple of \$5, and the total amount of such notes in circulation at any time shall not exceed the amount of the unimpaired paid-up capital of the bank (section 51, Bank Act).

"If the total amount of the notes of the bank in circulation at any time exceeds the amount authorised by this section, the bank shall incur penalties as follows: If the amount of such excess is not over \$1000, a penalty equal to the amount of such excess; if the amount of such excess is over

\$20,000 and is not over \$100,000, a penalty of \$1000

100,000 " 200,000, " 10,000

200,000 " " 100,000

(sec. 51, sub-sec. 3).

"All banks are obliged to make such arrangements as are necessary to ensure the circulation at par in any and every part of Canada of all notes issues or reissues by them and intended for circulation, so that the note of any bank is taken all over Canada without any discount. Banks are obliged to make a deposit with the Minister of Finance equal to 5 per cent. of the average amount of its notes in circulation during the twelve months preceding July 1. The amounts so paid and kept on deposit as aforesaid shall form a fund, to be known as 'The Bank Circulation Redemption Fund,' which fund shall be held for the following purposes and for no other, namely: in the event of the suspension by the bank of payment of the notes then issued, or reissued, by such bank and intended for circulation, and then in circulation, and interest thereon; and the Minister of Finance shall, with respect to all notes paid out of the said fund, have the same rights as any other holder of the notes of the bank (section 54, sub-sec. 4)."

In short, Canada makes a large "raise" in relation to its population out of the currency and the banks; and, notable precedent for us and South Africa, it requires the banks to hold not less than 40 per cent. of their cash reserves in Dominion notes. The Dominion notes are also, as "gilt edged" bonds, sought after by insurance offices and other corporate bodies, the word "securities" having among them the one definite meaning of Dominion bonds or consols. Among ourselves the word "securities" is not to be depended on without specification. Again, scarcely less notable is the fact that now only has Canada established a mint, for the coinage of the gold and silver of its mines, the productions of which in the matter of output not having had justice done them. As to a gold standard of its own, each nation having one, it has always appeared to Canada an absurdity to seek to invent another. Nor has it ever, as the saying is, held stock in bimetallism, it being the current Canadian belief as more rational to get possession of other men's money than to worry over its standard, or, after all, what is the same thing, its percentage of copper alloy. Accordingly, throughout Canada anybody's money has always been good enough: French coin in Quebec and Montreal not less, not more, acceptable

than Italian, Russian, or Scandinavian; English and American coin in Toronto and London not more acceptable than the yen of Japan or the piastre of Egypt or Tunis.

Thus, were Canada now asked to give a hint to the Colonial Office or to South Africa, the latter directly or indirectly having prospective loans hanging over it for £100,000,000 to £500,000,000, Canada would suggest 40 per cent. of South African bonds to be held in the cash reserves of every bank of issue and deposit; and as the result of the war will in the end be many times more advantageous to South Africa than to England, all corporate bodies in South Africa, inclusive of mines and diamonds, should also be required to hold 40 per cent. of their actual capital (not merely of their paid-up capital) in like bonds, as an inducement for them to engraft the business of currency finance on their present business, that the public may be adequately furnished with a circulating medium in 1s., 8s., 16s., and 20s. notes countersigned by the Minister of Finance against South African bonds or notes countersigned by the Minister of Finance. Nor would Canada fail to remind South Africa that however nice and convenient it may be to hug old-time illusions about gold and silver, gold only counts now in commerce as a commodity, and is but a poor one at that. Further, that until California and Australia betook themselves to general industries they did no good to themselves by gold; and that the pursuit of the precious metals without concurrent general industries beggared Peru, Bolivia, and the Argentine, and wrecked Mexico. As a matter of fact, the world's commerce is now carried on in "Produce Exchanges" without coin, by gamblers in "futures," who sell cotton and wheat; and iron and steel and other things, spot or to arrive, as long as you please before the ore is mined or the cotton or wheat grown; and that while the commerce of Great Britain, which has to submit to the regulation of discounts by the holding of this or that sum in coin, has lost its authority and position in the markets of the world. The money of the commerce of the modern world is the "cable transfer," which is a flash by cable based on "credit," which in turn may be based on "securities" of the mere "chalk" quality.

Turn now to the fruitful finance of the United States, which has outlived the ignorance by which it was long assailed, and that is fast having the commerce of the world at its feet. The United States in 1860, essentially without a dollar to its name, had a greater finance problem before it for solution than that of South Africa at the present time, Mr. Hugh McCulloch, the Secretary of the Treasury in three administrations, informing us that at the close of Buchanan's administration in December 1860 the debt was \$65,000,000, and that proposals were invited for \$5,000,000 of Treasury notes to pay obligations on January 1 following, the accepted bids for which were only for \$1,831,000 at 12 per cent.

and the rejected bids for which were only for \$465,000 at 15 to 36 per cent. Taking compassion, the Bank of Commerce of New York took the rest of the loan at 12 per cent. ; yet at the end of the war in August 1865 the debt was \$2,757,803,616, with ruin long and deep threatened but never realised. For it is with nations as with individuals—the place for a man without money is the poorhouse and the place for a nation without money is a lunatic asylum.

Mr. Secretary Chase, afterwards Chief Justice, was the financier of the war, and, as an American, he shared the paternal feeling of his countrymen towards Canada. He had heard of the regrettable jobbery incident to the earlier railways in Canada, and he had observed that Canada had stood aloof from the free banking which had wrecked and also disgraced Indiana and Illinois, and that Canada, under the influence of its strong Scotch element, had set up as closely as it could in the Upper and the Lower province an approximation to banking in Scotland. He then set himself the task to evolve American national banking on the Canadian lines; an herculean task opposed at the outset by the New York, Boston, and Philadelphia bankers as a system of free banking, and by the State banks as an infringement of their privileges under their respective State laws. Mr. Secretary Chase, although opposed by him, appointed Mr. McCulloch as comptroller of the currency, and in the end McCulloch, as a practical banker of extensive experience, declared for national banking on the projected lines as the best the world had yet known. Chase's bank scheme was simple and definite in requirement. Capital had to be real, not imaginary, and fully paid up; it had to buy American bonds. The note circulation was to be secured on bonds with a ten per cent. margin (110 to the 100), that in case of the failure of a bank its notes would be at once redeemable, first from a five per cent. redemption fund created by the whole banks, and second by the United States Treasury. Third, all the banks would be subject to frequent examination by men appointed by the Treasury Department. The First National Bank of Philadelphia took the lead in organisation, with a capital of \$150,000 or £30,000. Others followed, among which were the now great bank, the First National Bank of Chicago, with a capital of \$100,000 or £20,000, and the First National Bank of New York, with a capital of \$200,000 or £40,000, each of the early banks, like those subsequent, reserving power to increase their capital. The American banks have no branches; those of Canada, like our own, have many branches, with a single head office. All the American banks are furnished with their notes, like the Canadian, and the note differences with some repetition may be dwelt on for a moment. The Scotch and Irish banks, in common with the Bank of England and the English banks of issue, have a large privileged note issue under the

Bank Charter Act, the bribe of Sir Robert Peel, without any obligation whatever to provide for their payment either in coin or, as Robert Louis Stevenson would have said, by their "poker chips"; the Bank of England so issuing £16,800,000, forty-two private banks £1,537,665, thirty-four joint stock banks £1,954,230, ten joint-stock Scotch banks £2,676,350, and six joint-stock Irish banks £6,354,494; in all, the bank notes privileged to circulate as money, without the obligation of "securities" behind them, is in no less a sum than £29,322,739. With a vengeance, that is a skeleton in the finance cupboard. Further, English banks, unlike those of Scotland and Ireland, have no more notes at command than they had sixty years ago, while the Scotch and the Irish banks may issue notes indefinitely on the charitable assumption that they hold gold against the increase, the City of Glasgow Bank disregarding the law by an additional issue of "poker chips" to the extent of £237,730, *vide* the liquidators' report. The Western Bank of Scotland "had an account with a firm who had sixty to seventy persons who, having nothing to lose, signed acceptances and in several instances were paid for so doing," and the liquidation of the "securities" of that bank covered a period of twenty years, at a cost of £121,291 7s. 3d. The Canadian banks, like those of Scotland and Ireland, have always on hand a practically unlimited stock of notes. On the other hand, the National Banks of America may increase their note issues indefinitely by depositing bonds with the Comptroller of the currency. Thus, England and Wales alone are exposed to dearth of notes and collapse for want of a supply.

But comparison is not yet exhausted; our note issues average £40,000,000, against which the average holding of coin and bullion by the Bank of England is £35,000,000, and quoting from the *New York Bankers' Magazine*, the money in circulation in the United States (fully detailed) is \$1,603,583,021 for a population of 70,000,000 at \$22.87 per head. Nor is that the measure of our handicapping for lack of notes against the industrial competition of the world, the Bank of France usually holding almost £150,000,000 in gold and silver, but mostly gold, while it issues say £150,000,000 of bank notes. In gold, silver, and bank notes we are also far behind Germany. It is all very shocking this financial blindness of ours. Money abounds everywhere but here. We have cheque books and cheques, which we worship as symbolic wealth, confounding it with real wealth of international value. In the import trades of Great Britain of 1844, on a joint trade of £150,000,000, Sir Robert Peel held that a note circulation of £37,000,000 was essential: now, with a joint export and import trade of £700,000,000 we should almost have a note circulation of, say, £200,000,000 instead of the miserably restricted note circulation of £40,000,000.

Two London men, bankers both, have in vain directed attention

to the subject of our weak position without effect. Whether now, in this time of stress, it will be taken up by public opinion before it is too late remains to be seen. Sir Samuel Montagu, M.P., a banker then of forty-four years standing in the city of London, contributed an article to the *Fortnightly Review* of March 1892, to which the reader may turn with advantage, its scope being wholly English. The other, Mr. Walter Bagehot—himself a banker, and then the editor and proprietor of the *Economist*—in his *Lombard Street*, tenth edition, 1892, writes at p. 30:

“If the aggregate of the bankers’ deposits with the Bank were £5,000,000, £3,000,000 of the sum will be lent by the Banking Department and £2,000,000 will be kept in the till (notes and coin?). In consequence, that £2,000,000 is all that is really held in actual cash against the liabilities of the depositing banks. If Lombard Street were suddenly thrown into liquidation and made to pay as much as it could on the spot, that £2,000,000 would be all that the Bank of England could pay to the depositing banks, and consequently all, besides the small cash in the tills, which those banks could on a sudden pay to the persons who have deposited with them.”

Again, at p. 333, Mr. Bagehot writes with reference to the Savings Banks: “In a general panic, were there a run on the Savings Banks they could not sell £100,000 Consols without the assistance of the Bank of England.” But in a time of panic the ability of the bank to sell Consols has been questioned by Mr. J. P. Gassiot, F.R.S., a director of the London and Westminster Bank. He says that on “Black Friday” the bank could not sell Consols on the market for its own notes, showing that notes are preferred to “Consols.”

Thus, with a war of the first magnitude on our hands, for which provision must be made on a great scale here and in South Africa contemporaneously, with endless borrowings for long periods (sought to be made longer!) by public bodies, now is the time to speak out on matters of fact and urgency with the chance of a hearing. Under the experience which lies to our hands in Canada and America, great loans of £100,000,000 to £500,000,000 are as unnecessary as they would be mischievous, our debt already a burden grievous to be borne. A ready, safe, and beneficent solution of the difficulty is to be found in a materialisation of our transcendental Consols, which in effect, in bonds terminable at a fixed period, would give Parliament the control of say £600,000,000, which, in addition to paying for the war, would put South Africa on its legs again, and at the same time cover all reasonable demands for national housing and old-age pensions. At home, following closely on Canadian and American lines, the banking system, from the Bank of England down, should be made national in its character by each bank receiving notes according to its real means in “Consols” and in gold for use as wages or for personal expenditure when not superseded by small notes as in

Canada and the United States ; and so long as stock in gold lasted either as coin or as a commodity for international use, supply taking its chance in the markets of the world like corn, no influence whatever would be exercised on the notes or on the business of the banks, credit now being the real money not only of commerce but of 97 per cent. of the home trade, as shown by the then Sir John Lubbock in an address before the Statistical Society, banks of deposit and discount to be placed under the same statutory regulations as banks of issue. As in New York, in the gold room, and in the Bolsa of Buenos Ayres, gold speculation until it cooled down would be crazy, but in reality less harmful than "futures" now are. We now, in short, are confronted with almost bewildering new finance conditions primarily as one of the outcomes of the war ; secondarily, by the perpetuation of a banking and finance system which cannot justify itself to common sense or to prudence or to reason ; and, were both now swept away, it would be the one, the only one, good result of the war in South Africa. And, having lost command of the markets of the world, is the position to be recovered by technical education schemes ? Certainly not. Recovery is less attainable by "learning" than by a subordination of finance to the money needs of production by industry and commerce. We have great resources, but at present they are either dormant or debauched.

P. BARRY.

MARS AND HIS PAYMASTER.

PATRIOTISM, the thirst for glory and renown, pecuniary reward, the prospect of plunder and rapine, devotion to a general, and devotion to God, are the motives which have acted most powerfully on man in effecting the destruction of his fellow man, most powerfully of all the last. No soldier fights with the invincible courage of the religious fanatic; none more uncertain and unsatisfactory than the mercenary, who at a momentous crisis in a battle has not infrequently transferred his services to the enemy, who would, perhaps, appraise them more highly.

The noblest deeds in the annals of warfare have been inspired by patriotism, used in the sense of liberty; the most glorious by the glamour of a great name. It is almost incredible how the fame of great generals from Alexander to Hannibal, and from Hannibal to Napoleon, have acted upon the imagination and swayed the wills of men. Military honour, pure and simple, has proved but a weak and ineffectual incentive to duty and heroism; combined, however, with more selfish and material motives it has yielded excellent results, as will be seen by the example of the Persian cavalry. The rallying cry of King and Country is of recent days: the great armies of history, invariably composed of many nations, with little regard to creed, colour, or language, would hear such a sentiment with scant enthusiasm.

The desire for strife must be a passion deeply implanted in the human breast. In the *Decline and Fall* Gibbon apologises to his satiated reader for conducting him through so many fields of blood and carnage; and judging by the scenes so graphically depicted on the Assyrian tablets, the kings of Assyria divided their time between hunting lions and hunting men—the latter for choice—for they actually revel in human gore.

In the primitive ages of the human race war was not so much a passion as a pressing necessity. A family, tribe, horde or community having found that it had devoured everything that would afford subsistence, and innocent of the resource to create more, must have migrated or inevitably perished. Encountering in their wanderings a people more favoured by situation, circumstances, and, perhaps, capacity than themselves, impelled by the pangs of hunger, they endeavoured to dispossess and despoil them. Coming to the historical period the struggle for existence would be less intense, and people having now

something to lose, would naturally be chary in entering into warfare without just cause, or the prospect of plunder, the latter of which would only be rare among primitive peoples. The early and excusable motive for war no longer existing, it had to be substituted by another—personal ambition. The nations of antiquity engaged in wars near and far simply and solely for the aggrandisement of the king. If the inscriptions are to be relied upon, the king is everything, the nation nothing. To investigate the pay and privileges which induced men to rally to the standards of their various kings and face the perils and hardships of the battlefield, is both curious and interesting.

The kings of Assyria shared the spoil with their soldiers; and besides, the soldiers were awarded a certain prize and meed of praise for every head of the enemy produced. It was the duty of an officer in the field to duly receive and register them, and this functionary proceeded with as little compunction and concern as he would about the most commonplace transactions of daily life. There is no means of estimating the proportion of the spoil which fell to the share of the soldiers; but whatever were their pay and privileges, the Assyrian soldiers were well fed, well clad, armed and equipped. They were men of splendid physique, and seem to have set about their work with the vigour and dash of a modern football team.

In ancient Egypt the military class belonged to the second caste. To this caste was assigned about eight acres of land per man, free of all taxes, of one of the three portions into which the land of Egypt was divided by an edict of Sesostris in order that those who exposed themselves to the perils and privations of war might be urged to approach their duty with more decision and vigour from the interest they felt in the country as occupiers of the soil. This remarkable people wisely decreed that it would be useless and absurd to commit the safety of the community to those who possessed nothing which they were anxious to preserve. Besides, the enjoyment of plenty and comfort have a powerful tendency to increase population; and as the military class became more numerous, the need for foreign auxiliaries and mercenaries was less pressing. And moreover, this system served the purpose of a first-rate military school: the privileges being handed down from father to son, the youths from childhood strove to emulate the skill and valour of their elders, and became almost invincible by the practice and confidence they thus acquired. For it was forbidden that a child should follow a different profession from that of his father, or that the son of a soldier should belong to any other profession than that of arms.

Each man was obliged to provide himself with the necessary arms, offensive and defensive, and everything requisite for a campaign; and was expected to hold himself in readiness for taking the field when required, or for garrison duty. Whether on exceptional

service in the field, or on garrison duty only, each soldier received a daily allowance of five pounds of bread, two pounds of beef, and about two pints of wine. Released from duty the Egyptian soldier returned to his farm, which was not only a substitute for regular pay, but tended to encourage habits of industry, and to instil a taste for the pursuits and pleasures of a country life. For the Egyptians were justly persuaded that such employments promoted the strength of the body, as much as the licentious idleness of city life impaired the physical and moral constitution. The pursuit of the various arts and crafts was regarded by the soldier as unmanly and contemptible; indeed, he was absolutely forbidden to engage in any such occupation. Like the Spartan soldier, he made war his profession, and deemed it the most worthy calling of generous and free-born souls. The mercenaries, however, whom the Egyptians invariably employed in time of war and national danger, acted on the principle common to their profession: *Pas d'honneur, pas de Suisse*. The trade or calling of the mercenary has ever been a prosperous and profitable one; highly civilised nations having almost invariably preferred to do their fighting by proxy.

The law of Solon exacted personal service from every citizen, with the utmost rigour. But this law was soon forgotten or ignored. Demosthenes found his countrymen abandoned and corrupted. They were too well skilled in the art of taking things easily to lightly engage in the arduous duties of the camp. The spirit which had successfully opposed the Persian invader had been allowed to evaporate in festivals and public entertainments. A violent passion for the theatre now banished all thoughts of business and glory. The treasure which ought to have been devoted to the defence of the State was consumed in the promotion of public entertainments; and the destiny of Athens was entrusted to the precarious service of a handful of ill-paid foreign mercenaries, "whose victories," declares Demosthenes, "have been over our allies and confederates; while our enemies have risen to an extravagance of power. And these armies," continues the orator, "with scarcely the slightest attention to the service of the State, sail off to fight for Artabazus, or any other person, and their general follows them: nor should we wonder at it; for he cannot command who cannot pay his soldiers. What then do I recommend? That you should take away all pretences both from generals and from soldiers, by a regular payment of the army. . . . And let it not be thought a small convenience that the soldiers are supplied with corn; for I am fully satisfied that if such a provision be made, the war itself would supply them with everything else, so as to complete their appointment, and this without any injury to the Greeks or allies; and I myself am ready to sail with them, and to answer for the consequence with my life, should it prove otherwise."

In a mutiny which broke out among his troops at Opis, on the Tigris, we catch a singularly interesting glimpse of the liberality which Alexander the Great lavished on his victorious soldiers. Leaping down at a bound among the malcontents with three or four of his generals, and pointing out the ringleaders to the guards, he ordered them off to instant execution. They were at once put to death, to the number of thirteen. A deep silence immediately settled on the vast concourse. "They to mutiny!" he exclaimed, in tones bitter and angry. Men who owed all to his father and himself—men who were once rude clowns dressed in skins, and now were satraps and generals loaded with the wealth of Lydia and the treasures of Persia and the good things of India. They thought, perhaps, he had spared himself, or kept too much for himself. Could any man show more wounds than he could, or accuse him of niggardliness in his rewards?

In the character of Alexander, Constantine and Napoleon was that indescribable personal charm which attracted and endeared soldiers to them far above the price of pay or reward. Alexander shared the hardships and dangers of the meanest of his soldiers, and Constantine was particularly attentive to the privileges and comforts of his fellow veterans (*comrades*), as he endearingly began to style them; while the *camaraderie* of Napoleon passed into a proverb.

The Persian Empire affords a rare and striking example of the difference between soldiers animated by a spirit of national honour and determination to defend at any cost their homes and lands, and a base crowd actuated only by the prospect of gain and plunder. The Persian infantry was composed of a half-armed spiritless crowd of peasants, levied on the spur of the moment by the allurements of plunder, and as easily dispersed by a victory as by a defeat. They trusted more to their numbers than to their courage; more to their courage than to their discipline. Opposed by the drilled and disciplined legions of the Roman Republic, this spiritless and untrained horde rendered a contemptible account of itself.

The Persians were equally unskilled in the arts of constructing, besieging, or defending regular fortifications, and yet they convinced the powerful and haughty Augustus that the western bank of the Euphrates was the limit of his dominion, and successfully disputed with the most warlike of his successors the boundary of the two Empires. If the Persian infantry was despicable, the cavalry was the finest in the world, and to a comparatively recent period continued so to be.

The nobles of Persia, in the bosom of despotism, preserved a strong sense of personal gallantry and national honour. From the age of seven years they were taught to speak truth, to shoot with the bow, and ride; and it was universally conceded that in the last two of these arts they attained uncommon proficiency. The most

distinguished youths were educated under the monarch's eye, practised their exercises within the gates of his palace, and were rigorously trained up in the habits of temperance and obedience in their long and laborious parties of hunting. In every province the satrap maintained a like school of military virtue. The Persian nobles held their lands by a feudal tenure, receiving from the king's bounty lands and houses on the condition of their service in war. They were ready on the first summons to mount on horseback, with a martial and splendid train of followers, and to join the numerous bodies of guards, who were carefully selected from amongst the most robust slaves and the bravest adventurers of Asia. These armies, both of light and heavy cavalry, equally formidable by the impetuosity of their charge and the rapidity of their motions, threatened as an impending cloud the eastern provinces of the declining Empire of Rome.

Though Carthage produced the most brilliant general, perhaps, the world has ever seen, Carthage was anything but a warlike nation. Commerce, not conquest, was the bed-rock upon which it reposed its claim to rank among the great nations of antiquity. Peace was to the Carthaginians as the breath of their lives; for peace spelt prosperity. To hold nothing by war which they could not hold without it, and to trade with those countries only where trade was its own passport and its own security, was the fundamental principle of their general policy. When war was inevitable, the merchant princes of Carthage rarely had occasion to risk their precious lives in the hazard of it, for there were plenty of Barbarians who for a little of their gold were ready and willing to throw away their lives instead. Those members of the Carthaginian aristocracy, however, who could not find a sufficient outlet for their abilities in more congenial spheres of activity, took to the profession of arms. These patriots, some ten thousand in number, were known as the "Sacred Bands." Clad in costly raiment and resplendent armour, they fought around the person of their general-in-chief, and often rendered splendid service to the State. This corps was select and exclusive, faring sumptuously from dishes of the rarest and costliest gold and silver plate; the number of their campaigns they proudly commemorated by the number of the rings on their fingers. The army of Hannibal, however, was made up, not of Carthaginians, but of Libyans and Libyphœnicians, Gauls and Spaniards, slingers from the far-famed Balearic Isles, Greeks and Ligurians, Volcians and Campanians; while the nomadic sons of the desert supplied his ubiquitous and irresistible Numidian light horse. The commanding genius and matchless skill of Hannibal welded this heterogeneous horde into an effective and almost invincible army. Wealthy beyond the dream of avarice, Carthage doubtless treated her mercenaries handsomely; but the exact amount of their pay is not ascertainable.

There is scarcely a plan or expedient known to history which Rome did not adopt to maintain her great armies in strength and efficiency. In the pride and vigour of her youth, her sons gladly paid for the privilege of fighting for her; but in the decline and decrepitude of old age, the most tempting offer failed to allure men to her standard. In the most glorious epoch of her history the use of arms was reserved for those ranks of citizens who had a country to love, property to defend, and some share in enacting those laws which it was their interest as well as duty to maintain. The poorest rank of soldier possessed above forty pounds sterling—an exceedingly high qualification when money was so scarce that an ounce of silver was equal to seventy pounds of brass. The general populace was not expected, nor indeed allowed to shed its ignoble blood in defence of the sacred golden eagle. Circumstances conspired to bring about a change in this system. Campaigns prosecuted at a distance from Rome, and often in the depth of winter too, pressed severely upon the citizen soldier; and therefore, the senate wisely prevented the clamours of the people by the institution of a regular pay for the soldiers. Then again the havoc wrought by civil discord rendered it necessary to recruit the army in the most distant provinces. The husbandman and the mechanic were encouraged in the useful prejudice that the profession of arms was more honourable and ennobling than the exercise of their respective crafts; and in the hour of victory the provincials considered their services amply rewarded if they were elevated to the distinction of Roman citizens—no airy title, seeing that they were thus delivered for ever from the burden of taxation. As the golden eagle expanded its wings, war was gradually improved into an art, and degraded into a regular trade. The soldier's calling became a distinct profession, and his services were remunerated on a somewhat liberal scale. In the reign of Domitian, the annual stipend of the legionaries was equivalent to about twenty-five pounds of our money. After twenty years' service the veteran received about two hundred pounds sterling; or a proportionate allowance of land. The pay and privileges of the Prætorian guards were, in general, about double those of the legions. As the extending frontiers and the imperial majesty of Rome could only be secured and supported by a large and ever-increasing standing army; and as the enervated youth of Rome and the adjacent provinces became more and more averse to the support of arms and the discipline of the camp, the pay and privileges of the soldier were increased at an alarming rate. Aurelian strenuously endeavoured to undo the evil wrought by his abandoned predecessors, by restricting the indulgences of the degenerate and degraded legionaries, and impressing them with a true sense of their duty and dignity. His military regulations were strict, and rigidly enforced. Gaming and drinking

he severely prohibited. The Sarmatian peasant expected that his soldiers should be modest, frugal, and laborious; that their armour should be constantly kept bright, their weapons sharp, their clothing and horses ready for immediate service; that they should live in their quarters with chastity and sobriety, without damaging the corn-fields, without stealing even a sheep, a fowl, or a bunch of grapes; without exacting from their landlords either salt, or oil, or wood. The public allowance, he reminded them, was sufficient for their support; their wealth should be collected from the spoil of the enemy. "The spoil of the enemy" was not infrequently held out by Rome, in her waning days, to whet the desire of her languid defenders. What that "spoil" too often turned out to be is dramatically depicted in Ruben's *Horrors of War*. Constantine the Great was reduced to the last extremity to maintain his army in strength and efficiency; the resources of the treasury were exhausted by the increase of pay, the repetition of gratuities, and by the invention of new emoluments and indulgences, which in the opinion of the provincial youth might compensate the hardships and dangers of a military life. The lands bestowed on the veterans, as the free reward of their valour, were henceforward granted on condition that their sons, who succeeded to the inheritance, should devote themselves to the profession of arms as soon as they attained the age of manhood; and their cowardly refusal was punished by the loss of honour, of fortune, or even of life. But the youth of Italy were now destitute of the martial spirit, and in spite of heavy fines, forfeitures, and menaces, they devised effectual means to evade military service. This horror of the soldier's calling became contagious, and as it spread through the provinces with alarming rapidity, demanded the most drastic measures to suppress it. Valentinian, in a law addressed to the prefect of Gaul, was obliged to enact that "these cowardly deserters shall be burnt alive."

The Prætorian guards who contributed so little to the building of the Roman Empire and so much to the destruction of it, demand a word in passing. They derived their constitution from the crafty and subtle Augustus. Sensible that his design of despotic power could only be supported by arms, he organised this powerful body-guard of some fifteen thousand men in constant readiness to protect his person or to crush the first motions of rebellion. These favoured troops he distinguished by double pay and special privileges; but as their formidable aspect would at once have alarmed and irritated the Roman people, three cohorts only were stationed in the capital; while the remainder were dispersed in the adjacent towns of Italy. But Tiberius, his successor, ventured on a decisive measure which riveted for ever the fetters of his country. Under the plausible pretence of relieving Italy from the heavy burden of military quarters, and of introducing stricter discipline among the guards, he assembled them at

Rome in a permanent camp, which was skillfully fortified and placed in a commanding situation—an innovation which proved fatal to the peace and security of the Empire. In their close proximity to the palace and the senate, the Prætorian guards were not slow to perceive their own strength, and the weakness of civil government; to view the vices of their masters with familiar contempt, and to lay aside that reverential awe which distance only, and mystery, can preserve towards an imaginary power. In the luxurious idleness of the capital, their pride was nourished by the sense of their irresistible weight; and it was hardly possible to conceal from them that they were the real masters of the destiny of the Roman Empire. The most virile and exacting of the Emperors were obliged to conciliate those haughty warriors, and to purchase their precarious faith by a liberal donative; which, since the elevation of Claudius, was exacted as a legal claim on the succession of every new Emperor. The guards maintained, and were prepared to enforce their argument that, according to the purest principles of the constitution, *their* consent was essentially necessary in the appointment of an Emperor. The defenders of the State, selected from the flower of the Italian youth, and trained in the exercise of arms and virtue, were the genuine representatives of the people, and the best entitled to elect the military chief of the Republic. These assertions, however defective in reason, became unanswerable when the furious Prætorians increased their weight by throwing their swords into the scale. The gratuities lavished on the guards were enormous: it was not unusual for an Emperor on his elevation to bestow from a hundred and twenty to a hundred and sixty pounds on each of them. Hadrian complained that the promotion of a successor had cost him, in this way, some three millions and a half sterling. The Prætorian guards pursued their imperious career till they rashly imbrued their hands in the blood of an Emperor, and finally disposed of the sacred throne by auction to the highest bidder. Their services in the field were inconsiderable and inglorious; enervated by dissipation and riotous living, they soon became incapable of the duties of their profession. The Prætorian guards were reduced by Diocletian, and suppressed by Constantine. Imperial Rome could neither command nor purchase the services rendered so generously and ungrudgingly to the ancient Republic. It was gravely asserted that Maxentius had lavished on his mercenary bands the riches which Rome had accumulated in a period of 1000 years; and yet the Roman soldier of his time, when hard pressed in the field, was often discovered "devouring the paths of flight." This conduct threatened to become so general that Julian determined to parade those fleet-footed warriors, in female attire, before the whole camp.

The Arabs, under Mahomet, continued to unite the professions of a merchant and a soldier; and his petty excursions for the defence

or, the attack of a caravan insensibly prepared his troops for the conquest of Arabia. The distribution of the spoil was regulated by a divine law: the whole was faithfully collected in one common mass; a fifth of the gold and silver, the prisoners and cattle, the movables and immovables, was reserved by the Prophet for pious and charitable uses; the remainder was shared in adequate portions by the soldiers who had obtained the victory or guarded the camp; the rewards of the slain devolved to their widows and orphans, and the increase of cavalry was encouraged by the allotment of a double share to the horse and to the man. From all sides the roving Arabs were attracted to the standard of religion and plunder—truly an alluring combination—and cunning. The Apostate sanctified the licence of embracing the female captives as their wives or concubines; and the enjoyment of wealth and beauty was a feeble type of the joys of Paradise prepared for the valiant martyrs of the faith. “The sword,” said Mahomet, “is the key of heaven and of hell: a drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night spent in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting or prayer; whoever falls in battle his sins are forgiven; at the day of judgment his wounds shall be resplendent as vermillion and odoriferous as musk: and the loss of his limbs shall be supplied by the wings of angels and cherubims.” The sentiment breathed in these words fired the intrepid souls of the Arabs with enthusiasm. The picture of the invisible world was strongly painted on their imagination; and the death which they had always despised became an object of hope and desire. The Koran inculcates in the most absolute sense the tenets of fate and predestination, which would extinguish both industry and virtue if the actions of man were governed solely by his speculative belief. Yet their influence in every age has exalted the courage of the Saracens and Turks. The first companions of Mahomet advanced to battle with a fearless confidence: there is no danger where there is no chance; they were ordained to perish in their beds; or they were safe and invulnerable amidst the darts and spears of the enemy.

In the Tartar camp the soldier was held sacred from all servile labours, which were abandoned to slaves and strangers, and every labour was servile save the profession of arms. Each officer and soldier was made responsible, under the pain of death, for the safety and honour of his companions; and the spirit of conquest breathed in the law that peace should never be granted unless to a vanquished and suppliant foe. The Tartars enjoyed a free and open life, the arduous business of war being seasonably relieved by the pleasures of the chase. The Tartar women prided themselves less on their personal charms than on their domestic qualities and powers of endurance, a circumstance which did not prove the least of the incentives which urged their husbands to the hazard of war and conquest.

The troops of Othman, the founder of the Ottoman Empire, had consisted of loose squadrons of Turkish cavalry, who served without pay and fought without discipline, but a regular body of infantry was established by the prudence of his son Orchan. A considerable number of volunteers were enrolled with a small stipend, but with the permission of living at home, unless they were summoned to the field. Their rude manners and seditious temper disposed Orchan to educate his young captives as his soldiers, and those of the Prophet; but the Turkish peasants were still allowed to mount on horseback and follow his standard, with the appellation and the hopes of freebooters. When Orchan reduced the cities of Nice and Nicomedia the widows of the slain were given to these faithful followers. When all other inducements proved fruitless, the prospect of enjoying the wine and embracing the fair women of Southern Europe never failed to revive the flagging spirits of the semi-barbarian hordes which poured into it from the north and the east.

From the time of Orchan and the first Amurath, however, the Sultans were persuaded that a government of the sword must be renewed in each generation with new soldiers; and that such soldiers must be sought, not in effeminate Asia, but among the hardy and warlike nations of Europe. The provinces of Thrace, Macedonia, Albania, Bulgaria, and Servia became the perpetual seminary of the Turkish army; and when the royal fifth of the captives was diminished by conquest, an inhuman tax of the fifth child, or of every fifth year, was rigorously levied on the Christian families. At the age of twelve or fourteen years the most robust youths were torn from their parents; their names were enrolled in a book; and from that moment they were clothed, taught and maintained for the public service. According to the promise of their appearance, they were selected for the royal schools of Boursa, Pera, and Adrianople, submitted to the care of bashaws, or disposed in the houses of the Anatolian peasantry. It was the first care of their masters to instruct them in the Turkish language; their bodies were exercised by every labour that could fortify their strength; they learned to wrestle, to leap, to run, to shoot with the bow, and afterwards with the musket; till they were drafted into the chambers of the janizaries, and severely trained in the military or monastic discipline of the order. The youths most conspicuous for birth, talents, and beauty were attached to the palace or to the person of the Sultan. In four successive schools, under the roof of the white eunuchs, the arts of horsemanship and of darting the javelin were their daily exercise. As they advanced in seniority and merit they were gradually drafted into the service. The Ottoman soldier was trained by the virtues of abstinence to those of action, by the habits of submission to those of command. The

silence and sobriety of these troops under arms have extorted the reluctant praise of their Christian enemies, and have often been contrasted by them with the vices, intemperance and disorder which formerly contaminated the armies of Europe.

So changed have become the ideals of men and their springs of action, that it is now hardly possible to realise the motives which inspired the Crusaders. To know that in the Council of Clermont, Urban the Second proclaimed a *plenary indulgence* to those who should enlist under the banner of the Cross, the absolution of *all* their sins, and a full receipt for *all* that might be due of canonical penance, assists but feebly the imagination of the cool and sceptical modern. In the age of faith, however, the effect of this decree was far-reaching and electrical. At the voice of their pastor, we are told, the robber, the incendiary, the homicide arose by thousands to redeem their souls, by repeating on the infidels the same deeds which they had exercised against their Christian brethren, and the terms of atonement were eagerly embraced by offenders of every rank and station. War and adventure were the reigning passions of the Franks or Latins; and they were enjoined to gratify those passions, to visit distant lands, and to draw their swords against the nations of the East. Their victory, or even their attempt, would immortalise the names of the intrepid heroes of the Cross; and the purest piety could not be insensible to the most splendid prospect of military glory; their fancy already grasped the golden sceptres of Asia; and the conquest of Apulia and Sicily by the Normans might exalt to royalty the hopes of the most private adventurer. Besides, the natural and artificial wealth of the Mahometan countries had been magnified by the tales of pilgrims and the gifts of an imperfect commerce. The vulgar, both the great and small, were brought to believe every wonder, of lands flowing with milk and honey, of mines and treasure, of gold and diamonds, of palaces of marble and jasper, and of odoriferous groves of cinnamon and frankincense. In this earthly paradise each warrior depended on his sword to carve a plenteous and honourable establishment, which he measured only by the extent of his wishes. The vassals and soldiers trusted their fortunes to God and their master: the spoil of a Turkish Emir might enrich the meanest follower of the camp, and the flavour of the rare wines of the East, combined with the beauty of the Greek women, were perhaps not without their influence on the champions of the Cross. The love of freedom too was a powerful incitement to the multitude who were oppressed by feudal tyranny. Under the banner of the Cross, the peasants and burghers who were attached to the servitude of the glebe might escape from a haughty lord, and transplant themselves and their families to a land of liberty. The debtor might suspend the accumulation of usury and the pursuit of his creditors; and out-

laws and malefactors of every cast might continue to brave the laws and elude the punishment of their crimes.

The treatment meted out by England to her soldiers and defenders has been sometimes exceedingly generous and at others just as scurvy and niggardly. The lowest money paid by Henry VIII. to his soldiers was 6*d.* a day, a sum which possessed the purchasing power of six shillings of our money. In determining the rate of pay for his soldiers Henry VIII. adopted the common-sense plan of not offering less than the current rate of wages obtainable by a labouring man.

When Somerset, the Protector, invaded Scotland with an army of twenty thousand men, the daily allowance of every soldier was two pounds of meat, a pound of bread or biscuit, and a pint of wine imperial measure; and Somerset was careful to observe that this generous fare should be of the very best quality.

On the other hand, Froude declares that Elizabeth never paid the men who defeated the Armada, but allowed them to die a lingering death of wounds and starvation. For years after that great victory nothing could be heard in the towns and villages of the South Coast but groans and moans of soldiers and sailors maimed, destitute and neglected.

In the *Soldier's Fortune*, Otway gives us a vivid and impressive picture of the way in which the services of the soldier were appraised at the Restoration, and poor Otway wrote from bitter personal experience. He obtained a cornet's commission in a new regiment of horse, which was sent out to join the army under Monmouth in Flanders. Very shortly after, however, the troops were disbanded and recalled, while the money voted by the Commons for their payment was shamefully misappropriated, they being paid only by debentures, the credit of which was so low that they were hardly saleable. It is thus Otway gives vent to his feelings:

"*Courtine.* A curse on the fates! Of all strumpets, fortune's the basest. 'Twas fortune made me a soldier, a rogue in red, the grievance of the nation; fortune made the peace just when we were on the brink of war! Then fortune disbanded us, and lost us two months' pay: fortune gave us debentures instead of ready money, and by very good fortune I sold mine, and lost heartily by it, in hopes the grinding ill-natured dog that bought it will never get a shilling for it.

"*Beaugard.* Leave off thy railing, for shame! It looks like a cur that barks for want of bones. Come, times may mend, and an honest soldier be in fashion again.

"*Cour.* These greasy, fat, unwieldy, wheezing rogues that live at home, and brood over their bags, when a fit of fear's upon them, then if one of us pass but by, all the family is ready at the door to cry, 'Heaven bless you, sir! the Laird go along with you!'

' " *Beau.* Ah, good man ; what pity 'tis such proper gentlemen should ever be out of employment !

" *Cour.* But when the business is over, then every parish bawd that goes but to a conventicle twice a week, and pays but scot and lot to the parish, shall roar out, ' Faugh, ye lousy red-coat rake-hells ! hout, ye caterpillars, ye locusts of the nation ! you are the dogs that would enslave us all, plunder our shops, and ravish our daughters, ye scoundrels ! '—*The Soldier's Fortune, Act I, Sc. I.*

In later times the pay of the soldier appears to have been based upon the principle laid down by Gibbon—that the courage of the soldier is found to be the cheapest and most common quality of human nature

AUSTIN MURRAY STEVENS

THE COBDEN CLUB AGAINST FREE TRADE.

IN a recent number of the *Strand Magazine* Mr. H. W. Lucy—better known, perhaps, as “Toby, M.P.”—tells us that he would “not be surprised to see his Majesty’s present Government go to the country under the flag of Fair Trade. That, of course, might involve the resignation of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, but “for the rest, his Majesty’s Ministers, one and all, are open to conviction on the question of Fair Trade.” “The basis of my own suspicion on the matter,” says Mr. Lucy, “is the knowledge of the fact that one of the most powerful and persuasive of them is already converted. Remembering his history and his early personal associations, a very startling conversion it is. But in the present Cabinet there have been others to equal it.” And Mr. Lucy significantly reminds us that, while “present appearances” may seem to indicate that the next general election is afar off, “general elections sometimes come like a thief in the night”—as did, for example, the snatch election of last year.

We believe that Mr. Lucy has correctly foreshadowed the intentions of his Majesty’s Government. Such a course would seem, in fact, to be the only one that affords them the slightest chance of success; and it is very clear that the Ministerial organs, from the *Times* to the *Daily Mail*, have for a long time past been endeavouring to prepare the public for some such step. We have been told, not once nor a dozen times only, that we must “broaden the basis of taxation;” a persistent effort has been made to work up a scare in regard to foreign competition, and to din it into the ears of the electors that in “Fair Trade,” *alias* “Reciprocity,” *alias* “Protection,” lies our only hope of industrial and commercial security; and Tory scribes have even gone so far as to advocate a registration duty on corn.

The Government is, indeed, in a very bad way. The war—“over” in October last for the purposes of the general election—has dragged wearily on into its third year, and the war bill mounts up and up, at the rate of £8,000,000 to £10,000,000 per month, with no prospect of the drain being lessened for a twelvemonth or more. What more likely, then, than that this landlord Government, at

their wits' end to devise fresh means of obtaining revenue, should raise the cry of "Fair Trade," and, under pretence of "protecting home industries," not merely protect their own pockets from the attentions of the tax-gatherer, but even, perchance, by way of a tax on corn, find means to fill the coffers of the State—and their own pockets.

In his "Radical days" (January 5, 1885) the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain sounded a clear note of warning against this very danger.

"The owners of property [said he], those who are interested in the present state of things, the men who have privileges to maintain, would be glad to entrap you from the right path by raising the cry of 'Fair Trade,' under which they cover their demand 'protect industry,' and in connection with which they would tax the food of the people in order to raise the rent of the landlord."

But the erstwhile champion of Free Trade has himself strayed from the right path. He has gone over to the enemy, and the note of warning, formerly sounded by him, must to-day be sounded against him and his landlord confederates.

His Majesty's present Government, as the country has only too much reason to know, are adepts at the "confidence trick"; and, unfortunately, the sinister design with which Mr. Lucy credits them is favoured by the fact that the generation who toiled and moiled and starved under the Corn Law¹ *régimé* have now all but passed away, the economic education of the younger generation of electors has been sadly and madly neglected, and Free Trade principles have, as a consequence, to a large extent lost their grip upon the people. Were that not the case, no Government could have long survived the imposition—an imposition in a double sense—of the countervailing duties in India, and no Government would have ventured even to hint at the reimposition of a tax on sugar and of the export tax on coal, condemned and abandoned some fifty years ago.

One of the chief causes of this recrudescence of Protectionist ideas, this general resurrection of Protectionist fallacies dead and buried long ago, is brought out most clearly, yet most unconsciously, in the latest publication of the Cobden Club, a memorandum by the Committee on "National Expenditure and National Income."

The motto of the Club, "Free Trade, Peace, Goodwill among Nations," the first thing to strike the eye on taking up the pamphlet, but serves at a time like the present—a time of universal unrest, distrust, and fear, of overgrown armies, and ever-increasing navies—to emphasise the failure of Free Trade to realise as yet the high ideals and aspirations of such men as Cobden and Bright; and a careful study of the pamphlet reveals the startling fact that the

¹ "A law which," said Cobden, "took from the poorest of the poor to add to the richest of the rich"—a description equally applicable to the doles system.

Committee of the Cobden Club do not know what Free Trade is. Small wonder, then, that the general public are befogged and bewildered, and fall an easy prey to the specious "fair trader."

The Committee of the Cobden Club, we repeat, do not know what Free Trade is. Either that, or they have so tender a regard for the vested interests that hamper and well-nigh throttle trade and industry, that they prefer to stultify themselves rather than lead the assault against the citadel of monopoly and privilege.

As to the first part of the memorandum, that dealing with public expenditure from 1870 to 1902, we need do no more than glance at it. An admirably compiled table shows that the expenditure of the United Kingdom, "including subventions to local authorities and including special loan expenditure upon military and naval and other works, such as the Uganda Railway, but excluding direct expenditure upon the Ashantee War in 1870, and the South African and Chinese Wars in 1900-2," has increased from £66,000,000 in 1870 to £135,800,000 in 1902, or more than 100 per cent.; and that in that period the expenditure on the Army has increased from £12,300,000 to £29,600,000, or nearly 250 per cent.; and that on the Navy from £9,400,000 to £30,800,000, that is to say, considerably over 300 per cent.

"Not much 'peace and goodwill' there!" you would say.

No; so little "peace and goodwill" is there that conscription stares us in the face. "The growth [of expenditure] upon the Army," say the Committee, "has not been so great as upon the Navy, but such increase as there has been is less justifiable. An even more formidable increase is now threatened, and the party of aggression scarcely disguise their desire to impose upon the country the hateful blood-tax of conscription." And the Committee point out that "If the military expenditure of India and the Colonies be added to that of the United Kingdom, it will be found that the total, including loan expenditure, amounts to approximately £52,000,000 [an increase of some 600 per cent.] as compared with about £33,000,000 for the Navy."

We are chiefly concerned, however, with the second section, on "National Income."

"The progress of the revenue of the United Kingdom [say the Committee] is remarkable. Year by year it has continued to grow, and has enabled us to pay our way in spite of increased expenditure, and, in addition, to pay off a large amount of the National Debt. The following figures show the growth of revenue up to the period when the war taxation began :

MILLIONS STERLING.

	1870.	1880.	1890.	1895.	1900.
National Revenue . . .	73·7	79·3	94·6	101·7	129·8
National Debt . . .	799·6	776·5	690·7	660·2	639·2

"These figures by themselves furnish a striking testimony to the general soundness of the fiscal system which has until the present year been accepted with approval by all political parties. Whatever theoretical objections may be brought against the system, or whatever may be its defects of detail, no one in face of these figures can deny that it has proved a marvellous instrument for raising revenue."

The Committee of the Cobden Club, it would appear, confound Free Trade with mere revenue-tariffism. Otherwise they could hardly speak of the "general soundness of the [present] fiscal system," and regard it as being open only to "theoretical objections" and defective merely in "detail." From the revenue-tariff standpoint such views would be intelligible. As the deliberate expression of opinion of a professedly Free Trade organisation they are simply astounding. A "marvellous instrument for raising revenue" indeed! Rather, a marvellous method of plucking geese without making them squeal.

But there is worse to follow. The Committee continue:

"We hold, however, that the system is as sound in its main theories as it has proved productive in practice. Those theories may be briefly stated thus:

- "(1) To interfere as little as possible with the free course of trade.
 - "(2) To tax highly articles of consumption not absolutely necessary, and to tax lightly necessities of life.
 - "(3) To raise a due proportion of the revenue by direct taxation.
- "In accordance with the first principle nearly seventeen hundred separate taxes were swept away between the years 1817 and 1874, and only some half-dozen staple articles were left subject to taxation. The result has been not to diminish the revenue derived from the taxation of commodities, but to largely increase it; for the resulting freedom of trade has permitted the commerce of the country to expand enormously, and that expansion has been followed by increased population and increased prosperity, which in turn have led to increased consumption.

"The second principle may be defended on the practical ground that it diminishes the necessary hardships of taxation by making the payment of taxes to a certain extent voluntary.

"The third principle is imperative, in order to establish an equitable distribution of taxation between the rich and the poor. If all taxes were levied upon consumption, the poor man with a large family would pay more to the State than the rich man with no family.

"It has been the policy of the last sixty years to increase the proportion of the revenue raised by direct taxation. That policy is entirely sound, and has not yet proceeded sufficiently far. Before the war-taxation of the last two years the poorer classes were still contributing, in proportion to their ability, an excessive share of the total revenue of the State. Any reform of our fiscal system ought therefore to take the direction of increasing the contributions from the rich and diminishing those from the poor."

"Sound in its main theories"! In the name of the Prophet, figs! Do Free Trade principles involve nothing beyond the abolition of protective tariffs? That would seem to be all they mean to this Committee of the Cobden Club! The abolition of protective duties has, indeed, largely increased our Customs revenue, and "the result-

ing freedom of trade," partial though it is, "has permitted the commerce of the country to expand enormously, and that expansion has been followed by increased population and increased prosperity, which in their turn have led to increased consumption"—*and increased rents*. An enormous expansion of commerce and prosperity means an enormous expansion of the demand for factories, warehouses, and shops, and each of these requires a site of land; it means also an enormous expansion of the demand for raw materials of every kind, and the land is our only raw material. Increased population means an increased demand for houses, and every house requires a site of land. Increased consumption involves increased production, and increased production involves an increased demand for raw materials; that is to say, for land. As a consequence, the enormous increase in the commerce of the country, and the resulting increased prosperity, increased population, and increased consumption have materialised in the enormously enhanced site-values of London, Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Birmingham, Newcastle-on-Tyne, and other great industrial and commercial centres. The workers, comparatively, have benefited but slightly from Free Trade. The bulk of the benefit has been reaped by the shirkers, who, sitting idly by, levy heavy tribute, in the shape of monopoly-inflated land-values, upon the trade and industry of the country. These things should be obvious to every man who has taken the trouble to master even the A, B, C of economics; but either they are unknown to the Committee of the Cobden Club, or the Committee prefer to wilfully ignore them.

Another elementary fact in economics is that before goods can be traded they must first be produced. Therefore, before trade can be truly free, not only exchange but production also must be free. But production can take place only on the land—man's only raw material, man's only foothold in space. Therefore, in order that trade shall be truly free, the land must be free, production must be free, and exchange must be free. These Cobden Club free-traders, it would seem, however, are content with freedom, and that only partial, of exchange alone!

But not only do the benefits of Free Trade materialise in ground rents; the same will, on analysis, be found to be true of the advantages accruing from the protection from foreign aggression afforded by our army and navy; from the security for life and limb and property secured by police protection in our towns and cities; in short, from public services, both general and local, of every kind. As Professor Thorold Rogers has well said:

"Every permanent improvement of the soil, every railway and road, every bettering of the general condition of society, every facility given for production, every stimulus applied to consumption, *raises rent*. The land-owner sleeps but thrives."

Surely it is not unreasonable to demand that the tax-gatherer shall awaken the sleeper and make him understand that inasmuch as he reaps the benefits of public services *he* must bear the burden.

At present not only do the labour and capital of this country bear the burden of imperial and local taxation, they bear the burden of the landlord as well. Labour and capital pay, on a peace footing, £140,000,000 in rates and taxes, and then, because of the advantages thereby secured to those who live and work in this land of ours, the so-called "owners" of the land levy upon labour and capital a rent tribute of no less than £200,000,000 for permission to live in the land of their birth and enjoy the public services for which, not the landlords, but they themselves have paid! The State renders the service, the landlord does nothing: but, while the State charges £140,000,000 a year only, the landlord charges £200,000,000!

Under our present fiscal system, that is to say, labour and capital have to pay twice over for public services, general and local--and they pay £60,000,000 a year more to the worse than useless landlord than to the State!

The Committee of the Cobden Club, it would seem, know no more of the true inwardness of our fiscal system than the babe unborn! They speak of its "general soundness," "theoretical objections," "defects of detail"!

Surely, it would hardly be too much to say that the system is wholly unsound, that it is open to the gravest practical objections, and that it is defective in every detail.

They would have us believe, forsooth, that the system is "sound in its main theories"! And they have kindly formulated these theories for us!

Surely, it is manifest, from what we have stated above, that the sound principles of taxation are, not those we have quoted from the memorandum, but rather:

(1) That taxation must not interfere in the slightest degree with the free course of trade;

(2) That neither luxuries nor necessities should be taxed, nor, indeed, wealth in any of its forms; and

(3) That *all* public revenues should be raised by appropriating to public purposes the land value arising from the presence, the collective enterprise and industry, and the collective expenditure of the whole community.

It is, further, utterly absurd, if not, indeed, consciously dishonest, for the authors of this precious memorandum to defend their second principle of taxation—"To tax highly articles of consumption not absolutely necessary, and to tax lightly necessities of life"—on the ground that it makes "the payment of taxes to a certain extent voluntary." "To a certain extent," forsooth! Tobacco is a typical

luxury, tea a typical necessary of life. For every shilling spent by the working man on tobacco, 2*d.* represents the actual value of the tobacco, 10*d.* goes in duty. For every shilling spent by his wife on tea, 6*d.* represents the actual value of the tea, the other 6*d.* goes in duty. To what extent are these taxes voluntary? Supposing that every time a working man bought *twopennyworth* of tobacco he had to buy and cancel a *tenpenny* revenue stamp; supposing that every time his wife bought *sixpennyworth* of tea she had to buy and cancel a *sixpenny* revenue stamp; supposing that the workers realised that through the duties on tea, coffee, cocoa, sugar, dried fruits, beer, spirits, and tobacco they pay each year on the average the equivalent of an income tax of 3*s.* 1*d.* or 3*s.* 5*d.* in the pound, as against the rich man's 1*s.* 2*d.* in the pound—how long, think you, would such taxes remain in force? Let the geese but realise that they are being plucked, and they will squeal to some purpose.

As for their third principle of taxation, a tax on land values—a tax that would appropriate collective earnings to collective needs—is the only honest, the only equitable tax. And the tax on land values, moreover, not only would not burden trade and industry, but being levied on the full yearly value of all land, whether put to use or not, it would force idle land into use, and thus relieve labour and capital of the burden of monopoly-swollen values.

"It has been," we are told, "the policy of the last sixty years to increase the revenue raised by direct taxation." But what of the policy of the past five centuries? Under the feudal system the landholders—to-day they are in the eye of the law *landholders*, not *landowners*—either rendered themselves or paid for in various dues, practically all the public services for which the general mass of us now pay rates and taxes. The barons maintained the army and the navy, acted as unpaid magistrates, policed their districts, repaired the roads and bridges, &c. &c.; the Church lands supported the Church, the poor, and education; and the Crown lands maintained the Crown. But the landholders controlled, up to 1832, both Houses of the Legislature, and for four or five centuries their policy was to shuffle out of the feudal dues and services, on condition of which they held the land, and, while still retaining the land, to shoulder all the burdens of State on to the people. And that policy—the doles and the Imperial grants-in-aid of local taxation are but a continuation of it—has proved only too successful. As a result of that policy, the only remaining relic of the old feudal dues and services is the land tax of 4*s.* in the pound—a ghost of a tax, levied, not on the immense land values of to-day, but on the meagre, even then under-assessed, values of 200 years ago!

His Majesty's present Government attempted, in their Finance Act of 1896, to redress the inequalities of the land tax, which in some backward districts amounts to the full 4*s.* in the pound, while in

the great industrial centres it is only a fraction of a penny. As the *Financial Reform Almanack*¹ points out, however,

"This attempt is not based on a sense of justice, but the question is simply dealt with from the landowner's point of view. The rural districts get a reduction, but the deficiency is made up, not from the valuable town lands, but by the general taxpayer. The clause reads as follows: 'The amount in any year in any land-tax parish on account of the unredeemed quota of land tax charged against that parish shall not, after the passing of this Act, exceed the amount which would be produced by a rate of one shilling in the pound on the annual value of the land in the parish subject to land tax, and any excess above the said amount shall be remitted for that year.'

"It is unjust that poor districts should be called upon to pay more in land tax than wealthier districts, but the remedy is to make the tax one on the true annual value, as the Act itself stipulates. If this had been done the tax would [could?] have been reduced in amount to one shilling in the pound, and yet, while a relief equal to that given by the Finance Act would have gone to the rural districts, the total yield of this tax of one shilling in the pound on the true annual value of the land of the kingdom would have been at least ten million pounds. This would have permitted the abolition of the tea, &c., duties, and a reduction of the tobacco tax. So, as the result of making this land tax a tax upon the real annual value, the agricultural landowner would have obtained as great a reduction of his tax as he has got from the Conservative Government, and the farmer and the agricultural labourer, neither of whom will benefit by the mere reduction of the land tax, would have benefited by being able to buy their tea, coffee, cocoa, and tobacco much cheaper than at present. The only ones who would have suffered (!) would have been the immensely wealthy landlords of our large towns and cities."

Like the doles, like the old-age-pensions pledge, like last year's snatch election on the cry that the war was over, this is, in short, but another example of the "confidence trick":

"The abolition of this [land] tax has been claimed by the Conservative Party [concludes the writer of the article] as a relief to agriculture. The fact is that the people of this country pay the landowners *some couple of hundred millions of pounds a year* for permission to live upon the land of their birth. Out of this huge sum the landowners have had to contribute, in the shape of land tax, or State rent, about *a million a year*.² This a Parliament, composed largely of landowners, has reduced by £70,580, and [they] claim that by keeping this money in their pockets, and making the working men (among whom are the farm labourers) pay it for them, they are relieving agriculture!"

It would have been more to the point if, instead of stating vaguely, "The poorer classes were still contributing, in proportion to their ability, an excessive share of the total revenue of the State. Any reform of our fiscal scheme ought therefore to take the direction of increasing the contributions from the rich and diminishing those from the poor," the Committee of the Cobden Club had laid before the electors such facts and figures as the above. If, as would seem to be the case, the Committee are incapable of pointing out

¹ See article on "The Land Tax," pp. 138-4.

² Italics ours.

what action should be taken in regard to these matters, they might at least have put the electors in a position to study the facts and figures for themselves and draw their own conclusions.

The Committee do, indeed, when considering which of the existing taxes might have been increased to provide the £7,000,000 raised by the sugar duty and the coal tax, deal with the question of the doles to the landlords, but in regard to the land tax there is not, from beginning to end of their memorandum, one single word!

And what, in their view, are the existing taxes that might have been increased?

The Committee suggest (1) that the tax on beer (one of the working man's few luxuries) might have been increased from 7s. 9d. to 12s. 6d. a barrel; (2) that the tea tax (surely tea is to-day a necessary of life), which was 2s. 3½d. per pound a couple of generations ago, and 1s. 9d. at the time of the Crimean War, is now only 6d., and that "the small addition of 2d. to this tax would have given the Chancellor of the Exchequer more than the revenue he hopes to obtain from the new coal tax"; (3) "tobacco is a commodity that could certainly be made to yield a larger revenue"; (4) "in addition, there is a considerable revenue to be obtained by increasing the licence duties paid by the retailers of beer and spirits. Under the existing scale of licences the owner of a licence obtains for a trifling payment to the State a practical monopoly which often has a selling value of several thousand pounds. If the present licensing system is to continue, the holders of licences should, in fairness to the rest of the community, be made to pay to the State the full market value of the partial monopoly conceded to them"; (5) by renewing the doles to the landlords "the Chancellor of the Exchequer is sacrificing a revenue of, roughly, one and a half millions a year, or more than the equivalent of a halfpenny in the pound on the income tax"; and (6), referring to the income tax they say, "For the much less costly war with Russia in 1856 the tax was raised to 1s. 4d. It should certainly have been raised to the same figure now."

And summing up this part of their subject the Committee say:

"By the methods here briefly indicated it would be possible to raise an additional revenue of £25,000,000 to £30,000,000 without disturbing the existing freedom of any trade, *and without imposing an unfair burden on any class of taxpayers*¹. With this additional revenue it would be possible to wipe off the whole of the estimated cost of the South African War in four years. Instead of attempting thus to utilise the magnificent instrument of revenue he inherited from his predecessors, and instead of honestly meeting the obligations imposed by the war, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has wantonly gone out of his way to disturb the fiscal system

¹ Italics ours.

upon which our commercial prosperity so closely depends, and has thrown upon succeeding generations over a hundred millions of new debt."

Cobden Club ideas of what is fair or unfair in matters of taxation are of the queerest.

From the standpoint of a short-sighted expediency it might be argued that an additional tax on beer, on tea, on tobacco, or on incomes would be preferable to the sugar duty and the coal tax; but, from the standpoint of principle, such taxes are, like the coal tax and the sugar tax, sheer robbery, and instead of being increased they should be repealed as quickly as may be.

The doles, however, should certainly not have been renewed. As the authors of the memorandum point out, they are absolutely indefensible, "the net effect of the Agricultural Rating Act" being "to put into their [the landholders'] pockets an annual revenue which rightfully belonged to the nation." But this is true also of the Imperial grants-in-aid—"grants in aid of the landlords," as Mr. Gladstone termed them; and true, not only of the grants-in-aid, but of the whole of the unearned values appropriated by the so-called landowners.

The Committee of the Cobden Club seem to realise in a vague and bewildered fashion that the grants-in-aid put into the landholders' pockets an annual revenue which rightly belongs to the nation; for, referring to these grants to local bodies, they say:

"The effect of these subventions is to relieve the owners of fixed property from local taxation, whereas their property is very largely increased in value by local expenditure."

By "fixed property," we presume, they mean "real property," including, of course, both land and buildings. But to any one acquainted with the rudiments of economics it is clear that it is the land alone (not the buildings) that "is very largely increased in value by local expenditure"; and also that it is the landholder alone, not the owner of the buildings, that these subventions relieve; for houses, shops, factories, warehouses, &c., are worth simply what it will cost to reproduce them, and the increased facilities given by local expenditure will, if anything, tend to cheapen the cost of building, and so reduce the purchase-price or rental-value of houses, shops, factories, and warehouses.

It is the land-value alone that is increased by public expenditure. The passage above quoted should, therefore, read: "The effect of these subventions, or doles, is to relieve the holders of *land* from local taxation, whereas the *land* is very largely increased in value by local expenditure." And these subventions, as the Committee pointed out in the table of expenditure above referred to, have increased from £2,400,000 in 1870 to £13,500,000¹ in 1902. So

¹ This figure, presumably, includes the Rating Act doles.

that, lumping together the doles of recent and of older date, the Committee might have pointed out that in order to renew these subsidies to the landlord class this Government of Landlords are "sacrificing a revenue," not merely "of, roughly, one and a half millions a year, or more than the equivalent of a halfpenny in the pound on the income tax," but of *thirteen and a half millions a year*, or as much as the yield of a penny on the income tax, over and above the equivalent of all Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's new taxes—his 2*d.* on the income tax, his $\frac{1}{2}$ *d.* per lb. on sugar, and his 1*s.* per ton on export coal! In short, they might have demonstrated that Sir Michael's "war taxes" were in truth not war taxes but landlord taxes—taxes levied on the trade and industry of the country; taxes burdening the trade and industry of the country, in order to pour thirteen and a half millions a year into the gaping pockets of the landlord, himself the greatest burden on the trade and industry of the country!

It is somewhat curious that, like Earl Grey, the originator of the Public-House Trust scheme, the Committee of the Cobden Club cannot—or is it will not?—see that the arguments on which they base their claim that "if the present system is to continue, the holders of licences should, in fairness to the rest of the community, be made to pay to the State the full market-value of the partial monopoly conceded to them," apply with even greater force to the case of the land monopolist. "Under the existing scale of licences," they say, "the owner of a licence obtains for a trifling payment to the State a practical monopoly which often has a selling value of several thousand pounds." The landlord, on the other hand, has arrogated to himself the monopoly of the land, and he has shuffled out of all payments to the State, however trifling; for the tax of 4*s.* in the pound being levied on the values of 200 years ago, can have no tendency to force vacant land into use—the only thing that can prevent a landlord passing a rate or tax on to the tenant; and there is in this country no rate or tax levied on all land-values, whether the land be put to use or not. The landlord, as such, therefore, pays nothing in either rates or taxes, while receiving doles to the amount of £13,500,000 a year! And his monopoly, held in addition to this trifling payment *from* the State—a payment representing, at the bank rate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., a capital value of £540,000,000, or enough to pay for the South African War twice over!—has an annual value of £200,000,000, or a capital value, at twenty to thirty years' purchase, of £4,000,000,000 to £6,000,000,000!

How is it that, while straining at the comparatively gnat-like monopoly of the licence-holder, the Committee of the Cobden Club swallow, apparently without being aware of it, the double-humped camel of land monopoly?

The Committee seem at a loss as to how to adjust fairly the

income tax as between precarious and settled incomes. The thing is impossible. The "bold solution, . . . tried in South Australia and Victoria, where professional and business incomes are taxed at half the rate of settled incomes derived from investments," is no solution at all. The true solution is simply to stick to first principles, to condemn the income tax, whether on precarious or settled incomes, when such incomes *justly* belong to those who enjoy them, as sheer robbery, and to look to the only true basis of taxation, land-values, for all public revenue. The death duties, which are stated to be "a rougher method of effecting the same adjustment," are, like the income tax, sheer robbery; for, provided always that the property he devises is justly his, a testator has a right to bequeath his property to whom he pleases, and the person to whom he bequeaths it is morally entitled to receive it in full.

The Cobden Club must, indeed, be afraid of the taxation of land-values to be driven to adopt such a socialistic expedient as the death duties, and to advocate, not the abolition of the land monopoly, which alone makes vast and dangerous individual accumulations of capital possible, but the taxation of accumulated capital.

Fancy the Committee of the Cobden Club, of all people, voicing such arguments as the following:

"On general grounds we hold that as the nation grows richer so is the Chancellor of the Exchequer justified in drawing more and more of the revenue he requires from the owners of accumulated wealth. Taxes on capital were rightly condemned in the earlier half of the last century, because then every pound of capital was needed for developing the industries of the country. To-day the rapid accumulation of capital is becoming a social danger."

The truth is that the Cobden Club Committee have lost their hold on principle, and therefore they drift at random, like a rudderless ship, on the treacherous sea of expediency.

They should lay to heart the impressive words of him whom they profess to follow. Said Richard Cobden (October 21, 1836):

"Let not the people—I mean the masses—think lightly of those great principles upon which their strength wholly rests. The privileged and usurping few may advocate expediency in lieu of principles, but, depend upon it, we reformers must cling to first principles, and be prepared to carry them out, fearless of consequences."

Cobden and Bright foresaw the fight that must follow the anti-Corn Law struggle—the fight against land monopoly.

At Drury Lane Theatre, March 15, 1843, John Bright said:

"There was no institution of this country—the monarchy, aristocracy, the Church, or any other whatever—of which he would not say, 'Attach it to the Corn Law, and I will predict its fate.' In this country everything which he held dear was contained. In countries not far off they had seen institutions shaken to their foundations by dire calamities; they had seen crowns and hierarchies shaken to the dust; they had seen ranks, and

orders, and parties overthrown; but there was one party that survived all this, and that party was the people. Whatever convulsion might happen in this country, whatever orders might be overthrown, the people would survive. . . . He would now ask the meeting, What was their duty? What was the duty of all their countrymen? He would tell them that the question which they had to decide was, whether this was their country or the country of the monopolists? Were they sojourners in the land—mere lodgers—existing in this island, by the sufferance of the monopolists and the owners of the soil? Were the people to sweat at the forge, and to toil in the mill, and were they not to eat? The monopolists said 'Yes.' He had attended meetings in the provinces, and the provinces had spoken out, and acted as well as spoken. . . . He spoke in the names of the numerous meetings which he had attended throughout the country, and he called on them [the people of London] to raise their voices to the Legislature, and to co-operate with those meetings, until that blessed and happy day should arrive when this monopoly should be overthrown, and the blessings which God had provided for the whole of His people should be enjoyed by all."

Cobden, also speaking at Drury Lane, uttered an equally emphatic warning. Referring to the lauded aristocracy, he said:

"Let them go on, and in a short time they will find themselves, like the French nobility previous to the Revolution, an isolated, helpless, powerless class—a class that, in their own inherent qualities, in their intellectual and moral powers, were inferior to any other classes of the community. They not only clung to the feudal abuses, but they actually tried to put a restraint upon the supply of food for the people. They were warring against the progression of the age. They fancied that their feudal system was necessary to the existence of the community. Why, their feudal system had gone in France; it had gone in Germany; in America it had never existed. The question now was, whether the feudal system in this country was to flourish beside an advancing and progressive manufacturing community? There were manufacturing and commercial communities in other countries where feudalism did not exist. They would exist here by the side of feudalism, if feudalism would allow them; but if not by the side of feudalism, feudalism would not be permitted to stop the progress of civilisation; if not by the side of it, then the manufacturing and commercial interests would flourish upon the ruins of feudalism."¹

Again, what could be more significant than the following utterance of Richard Cobden:

"If you were to bring forward the history of taxation in this country for the last 150 years you will find as black a record against the landowners as even in the Corn Laws. If they want another league on the back of this one then let them force the middle and industrial classes of England to understand how they have been cheated, robbed, and bamboozled upon the subject of taxation."

Had the Cobden Club followed up the clue thus indicated, and had they, rejecting expediency, clung to first principles, and carried them out to their logical conclusion, fearless of consequences, they

¹ It will be observed that Cobden here denounces "feudalism," whereas the evil that he was referring to is clearly "landlordism." Were he alive to-day he would see that, while America has not got "feudalism," she has "landlordism," and is now suffering, intensified by protection, the evil effects which he attributed to feudalism.

would, we are convinced, have arrived at the conclusion that we have arrived at above, namely, that the landholders have fraudulently shuffled out of the feudal dues and services formerly rendered to the State in return for the land they hold, and that justice requires that, as quickly as may be, labour and capital shall be relieved of the rates and taxes that now hamper trade and industry, and the land shall once more be made to bear the burdens of State.

The natural first step in this direction would be the repeal of the Rating Acts and the levying of the existing land tax of 1s. in the pound on the present full true yearly value of all land. This would net a revenue of some £42,000,000; and, as was shown in the August number of this REVIEW, that sum would not only meet the interest and sinking-fund charges on the debt due to the present war, but would enable the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give payment of members and of election expenses, to abolish the breakfast-table duties, and to establish an old age pension of 5s. per week for every person over the age of sixty-five.

It is in this direction that true Free Trade principles point us. It is only by carrying out the taxation of land-values to its logical conclusion that the Free Trade ideal—that is to say, the abolition of all rates and taxes, and monopolies that interfere with the free course of trade—can be realised; for a tax on land-values is a tax only in form; it is really a rent paid to the State, as representing all, for the use of “the blessings which God has provided for the whole of His people.”

Were England to adopt full Free Trade, other countries would soon be compelled by the logic of events to follow her example; and thus would be realised the highest dreams of the pioneers of the Free Trade movement.

It is open to the Cobden Club to help or to hinder those who, true followers in spirit of Bright and Cobden, are fighting for absolute freedom of trade—free land, free production, and free exchange. It is open to them to help or to hinder; but should they choose the latter course, it is, we submit, hardly open to them to retain the name of “The Cobden Club.” They ought in that case to adopt some such name as “The Revenue-Tariff Club,” and apply for affiliation with the “Liberty and Property Defence League.” For this fight those who are not with us are against us. To the realisation of true Free Trade the mere “revenue tariffite,” the half-and-half Free Trader, is an even greater obstacle than the Fair Trader or the out-and-out Protectionist.

Must we write down the Cobden Club against Free Trade?

THE PROBLEM OF TUBERCULOSIS.

THE problem of pulmonary tuberculosis, its prevention and its cure, still occupies a large degree of medical attention, and it commands a greater number of specialists than any other branch of medical science. It is somewhat curious to observe the progress of knowledge in this subject, and how it now appears to us that the former generations of physicians either hurried their consumptive patients to their graves, or, at least, greatly retarded their progress. In the matter of climate it appears they were especially erratic or reckless. It was at one time supposed that Madeira, with its moist heat, was especially favourable to the consumptive patient. Then we were told that the dry heat of Egypt was to be preferred. Soon heat was found not to have been necessary for the cure, and physicians looked to the snow-mantled plains of Minnesota. At the present time many specialists recommend high altitudes, whether cold or hot, provided the air is dry. Nansen thought that the North Pole was the place *par excellence* for lung trouble, but we may safely presume that, in our generation at least, it will be left alone.

It is to be greatly regretted that physicians are not of one mind on the subject, as, amid the conflicting opinions of various so-called authorities, the unfortunate patient is at a loss to know what course to adopt, and invariably lingers, and perhaps dies. Cures have undoubtedly been effected by climate, by diet, and by symptomatic treatment; but up to the present no chemical specific has been discovered, and no physician can absolutely guarantee a cure under any course of symptomatic treatment.

It seems to me, however, that consumption is the one particular disease regarding the details of which the patient should be fully informed, except where morbidness is present to such a degree as to affect the temperature. Consumption being a disease peculiar to civilised communities, the first duty is to educate the public of our large cities. When small-pox, scarlet fever, or diphtheria reach the dimensions of an epidemic, all sorts of precautions are taken by our civic authorities to prevent further spread; but, curiously, consumption, on account of its insidious nature, does not seem to attract the attention it deserves.

Scarcely any towns in the United Kingdom, and but few in America, possess bovine laws, or take any active measures to prevent

consumption. It is only in health resorts like Colorado and California that there exist any practical methods to prevent the spread of the disease, and this is of course due to the fact that consumptives so largely abound in these districts. In Denver and in Colorado Springs there are stringent laws against expectorating either on the footway or in street cars, and these laws are rigidly enforced. In Louisiana any one can have his or her sputum examined gratis at any of the stations established in various parts of the town. Consumption being a disease for which the pharmacopœia can offer no specific, every facility ought to be offered for its prevention. Free medical examination, advice, and thorough education in the matter of treatment should be available in every thickly populated district in the world. The demand then for change of climate, sanatoria, and various other cures would not be so great.

It is fairly well known that one-seventh of all deaths is due to consumption, and we may add that one-sixth of all mankind (civilised) is tuberculous. This latter fact is proved by the percentage of tuberculous lungs found in *post-mortem* examinations. "There is hardly an autopsy performed in the Morgue," wrote Dr. Brouardel, of Paris, to Dr. Knopf of Bellevue, New York, "of persons having died an unnatural death where healed tuberculous lesions, cicatrised and calcified, are not found, especially if the individual has lived more than ten years in Paris." Professor James Goodhart, of Guy's Hospital, says that there is nothing more common than to find in those dead from other causes evidences of an old and healed phthisis, or calcareous changes in the various glands. "Moreover," he proceeds, "in most cases of tubercular disease there is similar evidence that a former disease of this kind has been healed. I am therefore accustomed to say that there is no disease which gives stronger evidence of healing tendencies than phthisis." Dr. Whittaker, of Cincinnati, regards it as a "great exception" to find upon *post mortem* a pair of lungs without indication of an existing or pre-existing phthisis.

I may proceed to produce from Dr. Knopf's evidence¹ a table showing how remarkably prevalent the disease really is, although, it is quite obvious, without the patients' knowledge :

Reported by	Number of Autopsies.	Number of cases where lungs self-healed are shown.
Boudet (Paris)	135	116
Beaux (Paris)	166	157
Bennet (Menton)	73	28
Baudet (Paris)	197	10
Marsini (Basel)	228	89

¹ *Prophylaxis and Treatment of Pulmonary Consumption.* By S. A. Knopf. Philadelphia, 1899.

Reported by	Number of Autopsies.	Number of cases where lungs self-healed are shown.
Bollinger (Munich)	400	69
Heitler (Vienna)	16,562	789
Chiari (Prague)	701	78
Flint (New York)	670	75
Loomis (New York)	763	71
Letulle (Paris)	189	92
Fowler (London)	1943	177
Martin (London)	145	42
Coates (Glasgow)	103	25

Regarding infection, I am inclined to agree with Dr. Gardiner (Colorado) in the opinion that the danger from this has been vastly exaggerated. There is a great deal of absurd nonsense written about the dangers of infection from cigars, bedroom linen, kissing on the mouth, the use of holy water, communion cups, Bible kissing, bakeries, butchers, caressing domestic animals, vaccination, the Jewish rites of circumcision, tattooing, and even speaking. No doubt it is very important to avoid any possibility of infection, but in being so careful of details we may neglect more important considerations. If a man wishes to avoid a shower of bullets in a battle, he would be more safely protected with a suit of bullet-proof armour than continually dodging behind walls and boulders. What is most desirable for us to do is to strengthen the body in order to ward off, or withstand, the attacks of consumptive bacilli. This can often be done by the mere choice of a suitable profession. While agriculturists, engravers (artist class), and butchers are comparatively free from tuberculosis, tobacconists, hatters, musicians, bookbinders and printers suffer severely, but the prevention of tuberculosis should properly commence in childhood, if not when the babe is *in utero*. That the great majority of cases are due to carelessness may be easily proved by a question to any consumptive patient, who will readily admit that his or her case could have easily been prevented.

Regarding the cure of consumption, it is generally admitted that the essentials are open air life, proper diet and rest. Many believe that a high altitude, such as Denver (5000 feet) or Colorado Springs (6000 feet), will in itself effect a cure. It may be true that the dry rarefied atmosphere of Colorado will tend to strengthen the lungs, but my experience is, that without proper dietetic and hygienic treatment such a climate will not even improve a patient. When a consumptive leaves home for a more congenial climate it is usually under the advice of the family physician who has "done all that medicine can do." The patient naturally thinks that his last resource is climate, and, having secured a pleasant dwelling resort, the advice of a physician is not at all necessary. This is where the invalid makes a great mistake. In places like Colorado or Denver

he is thrown together with patients like himself who take a morbid pleasure in discussing in detail their trouble; they all have different views on the method of treatment, and these are, needless to say, mischievous in their effect. It is absolutely ridiculous for any consumptive to merely trust to climate for a cure. A congenial climate is, in my opinion, useful only in so far as it enables a patient to live in the open air. But fresh air only will not cure or arrest consumption unless the patient is properly dieted, and obtains the requisite amount of rest and exercise. As the latter depends entirely upon the condition of the patient, a physician's advice is very necessary. Doctors are often thoughtless in sending patients away to high altitudes. It has been proved that an altitude of 4000 feet or over would be unsuitable for any of the following forms of phthisis: (1) Erethic type in any stage; (2) any form of advanced phthisis; (3) phthisis complicated by extensive emphysema; with (4) albuminuria; (5) heart disease; (6) ulceration of the larynx; with (7) rapid progress and constant pyrexia; with (8) great loss of blood; with (9) considerable empyema; and (10) all cases where the patient cannot eat or sleep and is constantly cold. Dr. Solly (Colorado) has pointed out¹ that in high altitudes the tendency to hæmorrhage is greatly diminished, but when it happens the bleeding is often very profuse. Cases of death from pulmonary hæmorrhage are indeed by no means common in the streets of Denver. I may add, too, that a marked increase in body weight is not usual even after a prolonged residence at a high altitude, while common observation will testify that the residents at such altitudes are not noted for any remarkable degree of robustness or strength, and the drawing power of horses appears to be considerably less than at the sea level.

During my stay in Colorado, what struck me as being most peculiar was the fact that no sanatoria worthy of the name existed.² At the "Home" in Denver, and at the Glockner Sanatorium in Colorado Springs, patients are under no sort of supervision whatever, there being no resident physician at either place. In many respects the Glockner is superior to the Denver institution, the quality of the food being plainer and more wholesome, the temperature lower and ventilation better, but the entire absence of discipline in both institutions reduces them, for all practical purposes, to the level of mere boarding establishments. Colorado Springs is essentially a health resort, and was originally planned for this purpose, and it is nothing short of discreditable that no properly equipped sanatorium exists where so many pulmonary invalids abound. I believe discipline is what a consumptive is

¹ *Medical Climatology*. By S. E. Solly, M.D. New York.

² Since the above was written a serious and promising attempt has been made by Dr. Holmes, of Denver, to found a sanatorium on an industrial plan.

most in need of. His rest, exercise, food, open air should all be prescribed for him, and he should be carefully watched that he does not fail to carry out the programme set down for his benefit.

No one can deny that by far the most successful physician in the cure of consumption is Dr. Walther, of Nordrach. Dr. Solly thinks that the reason the cure is so popular is that Walther gives permission for the patients to return home after a very short period. No doubt there are very few individuals who will not welcome the possibility of a speedy cure and a subsequent return to their friends, and I am confident that the knowledge of a brief sojourn helps them to submit to the most rigid form of treatment. As Solly says, many fall away again and succumb, but this might also be the case after many years of climatic treatment. It rests, to a greater degree, on the ability of the patient to subsequently live a regular and a rational life.

But it should not be necessary for English and American patients to go to Nordrach. It should not be necessary to leave one's native land at all. Of course a change of air has tonic effects which will inevitably be of great benefit, and if sanatoria were liberally scattered over the United Kingdom, cures which would be thus effected would be more perfect and permanent than any caused by continental means. Knopf, who recommends the establishment of home sanatoria, says: "I know from personal observation of quite a number of cases that cures of pulmonary tuberculosis effected in our home climates, which are, in the average, not considered as especially favourable to this class of sufferers, have been more lasting and more assured than cures obtained in more congenial climate away from home." This opinion is also endorsed¹ by Leyden, Gerhardt, Ziemssen, Dettweiler, Nannyn, Fränkel and Walther. It has been amply proved that weather has little to do with the cure of phthisis. Both Blumenfeld and Dettweiler aver that temperature, atmospheric pressure, and humidity scarcely affect the condition of the sufferer. Foggy weather will, of course, be depressing to an invalid, as indeed it is to a healthy person, and penetrating winds are dangerous, but the latter, at least, are to be found at high altitudes as much as at the sea level. Dr. Weber is both candid and concise when he says, "*Die Behandlung der Schwindsucht ist überall möglich wo für reine Luft, passende Nahrung und mässig graduirte Bewegung gesorgt werden kann.*" Knopf is also emphatic when he writes:²

"If I had to choose between sending a patient to what is usually considered an ideal specific climate, but where he would live as in an ordinary health resort, or keeping the patient at home in a fairly pure atmosphere,

¹ *The Practitioner* (Tuberculosis number), p. 670. London. 1898.

² *Prophylaxis and Treatment of Tuberculosis*, p. 205.

and applying the hygienic and dietetic treatment under constant medical supervision, I should choose the latter method of treatment and think the patient had a far better chance of recovery."

My experience of health resorts leads me to confirm this opinion. Living at boarding-houses one is compelled (at least in America) to adopt the ordinary regimen provided for the rest, and the preference for rich foods and pastries for which the American people are noted, is not always conducive to the physical welfare of a European consumptive. It certainly appears to me that a life out-doors, sleeping with windows wide open at night, and discreet use of food, will effect more good at home than a careless life in a pleasant climate. In my opinion, the reason why home cures are not more common is because the disease is contracted owing to the fact that the profession of the patient renders an open air life impossible. Without sending him to a foreign country, it would not be easy to induce him to undertake another line of business, and it is obvious that so long after his cure as he continues his former life he is liable to fall back into his old state. Still, if invalids must go away, I am strongly of the opinion that they ought to be under direct and constant medical supervision, whether it be in Nordrach, Falkenstein, Davos, Colorado, or in England. I have seen patients (especially women) wandering about Colorado Springs and Denver in an aimless fashion without being aware whether they were getting better or worse. They remain in their rooms under the slightest provocation, and, should they feel somewhat better one day, they will go for a long walk and return with a temperature of 102° F. This sort of thing may go on for years, whereas six months' rigorous treatment at a sanatorium would in all probability effect a permanent cure. Thus the efficacy of climate is so often and so vastly exaggerated that many who visit Colorado and New Mexico expect the climate to correct errors of an irregular life as well as eradicate the disease. It is probable that more lasting cures are effected in Davos than in Denver though the altitude of both are equal, as the former possesses the advantage of many excellent institutions for the treatment of consumption which teach patients, through discipline, how they should live in the future. In Denver, as I have said, no such sanatoria exist, and discipline among patients is entirely lacking. Somehow or other there is a prevailing notion among the laity in Colorado that the proper method of treating consumption is "go out on a ranch and rough it." Needless to say this is sheer nonsense. It is usually thought that ranch life consists of plenty of open air, horseback riding, fresh eggs, fresh milk, fresh meat, fresh bread, &c., as if everything "fresh" were good. For a description of the real ranch life I may quote Dr. Gardiner, of Colorado Springs, who says:

"I have been over the States of Colorado and Wyoming on horseback and at one time practised medicine for four or five years at a place a hundred and fifty miles from any railroad, among ranches in a cattle country, and my experience has been that it is all a well man can do to digest the average ranch food, and that most ranches are no place for invalids. The principal diet, as far as my rather extended observation went, was salt pork cooked in a sea of lard, soggy potatoes, baking powder biscuits, washed down with black, re boiled coffee, all taken with great haste and in absolute silence. Anything better or more varied was always a surprise to me; and it was, indeed, a noteworthy exception when I had properly prepared meat or vegetables at a ranch."

No doubt many cures are effected on ranches, but it is in cases where the digestive organs are unusually strong. The attractions of horseback riding encourage the invalid to take exercise when it is absolutely injurious to him, *i.e.*, when his temperature registers 100° F. to 102° F. If any consumptive desires to know if exercise is beneficial he should take his temperature after riding or walking, and if it be above normal it is an indication that he has over-exerted himself. To my mind exercise is the most difficult problem to solve in the treatment of tuberculosis, and it should be carefully regulated by the physician. We should remember also that mental exercise will cause a rise in temperature quite as easily as physical exertion. Passionate music and exciting literature are therefore to be avoided while any tendency to pyrexia is evident. Dr. Walther, of Nordrach, advises his patients to avoid all such violent exercises as cycling, hunting, dancing, &c., for at least two years after his treatment.

Having sufficiently proved that climate has nothing directly to do with either the cause or cure of consumption, medical authorities should devote all their energies towards proper legislation to eradicate the disease. America has done much, but opinion appears to be too divided for satisfactory results. For instance, if we examine the bovine laws, we find that local self-government is sometimes mischievous. The following States enforce bovine laws—California, Colorado, Connecticut, Iowa, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Jersey, New Hampshire, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Virginia, Wisconsin, Minnesota and South Dakota. Of the States having no bovine regulations I may mention Delaware, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Mexico, Ohio, Texas, West Virginia, Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois and Kansas. This want of unanimity causes in many instances serious trouble. A man has tuberculous cattle in a State where bovine laws do not exist. As soon as he discovers this, he drives them across the border to a friend who lives in a State where regulations are enforced. Here they are by law slaughtered, and the friend is recompensed by the Government. He and his associate proceed to divide the spoil and do pretty well over the transaction. Even if the slaughter of tuberculous cattle were not lucrative to the owner he would then be encouraged to send

his cattle to a "non-bovine" State where they would inevitably spread disease.

The kind of legislation England requires particularly is a system of insurance such as that adopted by the German State Invalidity Insurance Companies. At present, consumptives are practically prohibited from all forms of insurance, and considering that tuberculosis is really a preventable disease some practical scheme should be adopted to prevent it. In Germany when a labourer or servant enters upon any business he is compelled to insure against tuberculosis, and should he at any period betray symptoms of the disease, he is at once sent to the State sanatorium. This, to my mind, is a very sensible method of dealing with the consumption problem, for it seizes the disease when it most readily lends itself to treatment, and moreover causes less expense. Dr. Weicker, of Goerbersdorf, to whom many patients are sent, says that the percentage of such cures are far in excess of those effected in private patients; indeed his latest returns show a percentage of so established cures with an average of only $76\frac{1}{2}$ days' sojourn at the sanatorium. Thus, it will be seen, the Government sends patients to the sanatorium at a much earlier and more favourable period than the family physician. In 1879, thirty-seven of these Government insurance companies collectively assisted 4480 consumptives, of whom 4432 were sent to the subsidised sanatoria. In the same year these companies invested altogether 1,300,000 marks for consumptives, and for 1898 a fund of three to four millions has been destined for that purpose.

Here is work for the philanthropist, for the legislator, if not for the speculator. King Edward is not without interest in the matter, and the whole medical faculty is striving with heart and soul to battle with this scourge of civilisation. It is no use waiting for anti-tuberculin and magic chemical compounds to rid us of the plague in a few weeks. Koch was a failure,¹ but Walthor has been a success. We must not wait for the consumptive to report himself, but, if even for the protection of the species, save him from himself. In certain cases of poisoning our first duty is to keep the patient awake. This is what we must do to the consumptive—keep him alive to the importance of taking measures to stamp out the disease before he grows too weak to be careful, and too morbid to be otherwise than despondent.

HAROLD R. WHITE.

¹ This article having been written prior to the Tuberculosis Congress, this expression must not be taken in connection with Dr. Koch's new theory regarding the transmission of bovine tuberculosis to man.

ORATORY.

SINCE the time when masses of men were first influenced by the speech of their fellows oratory has necessarily been a subject of interest and inquiry. At the present day, when the increase of our local representative bodies and the growth of education have made public speaking more common among both men and women than ever before, an attempt to integrate our thoughts, experiences and observations regarding it ought not to be less interesting, or less fruitful, than in the past. It is a subject, however, which may not unnaturally be approached with some trepidation, seeing that it has been regarded as a difficult one by some of the greatest orators of the past. "Considering the great diversity of manner among the ablest speakers," says Cicero in his *de Oratore*, "how exceedingly difficult must it be to determine which is the best, and give a finished model of eloquence? This, however, . . . I shall attempt not so much from any hopes of succeeding as from a strong inclination to make the trial."

The evolution of oratory may be regarded as a branch of natural history. It involves such questions as how speech, as the great characteristic by which man is distinguished from brutes, has become associated with the varied movements and gestures by which our emotions are expressed, how is it that certain words and phrases accompany certain emotional expressions, what is the physiological effect produced on the hearer by these words and expressions? That the pleasure or distaste experienced by an audience as the result of a speech that is pleasing or the reverse has some physiological basis in the actual physical changes taking place in the organs and muscles of the body there can be no doubt, though as to what they are we may be wholly ignorant. The association of certain sounds with certain emotions is perhaps most strikingly seen in those lower animals which are, generally speaking, mute or comparatively so. Many animals emit sounds only under extreme emotion, as when in great pain or fear. Then their cries of agony or fright are what, when speaking of our own kind, we call heartrending, and convey to the most untutored ear a distinct and painful sensation of the emotions of the animal. This is an interesting fact, because the most powerful oratory is that which is able to arouse corresponding sensations in an audience.

What is oratory? Is it an entity incapable of analysis? On first thoughts one is disposed to say no, for there is every gradation from the simplest speech up to the most elaborate oration. But this assumes that oratory must necessarily be elaborate speech, which we know well is not the case, for among savage races endowed only with simple language and a very restricted vocabulary, oratory of a high order, if judged by its power to arouse the emotions and stir the passions of an audience and influence its conduct, is found.

I venture to lay down the fundamental proposition that true oratory is not capable of analysis for the simple reason that it must be unpremeditated. It is commonplace that in conversation the remarks and statements which are unpremeditated are those which tell, impress the hearer, carry conviction and have a freshness which is lacking in those carefully prepared beforehand. Both in conversation and in public speech spontaneity, freshness, truthfulness, forcefulness characterise the unpremeditated deliverance. Such unpremeditated utterances may be partially analysed afterwards and their characteristics to some extent discovered and noted down. And with this help it is no doubt possible to build up and prepare speech which shall have the same characteristics as, and when uttered simulate, that which is unpremeditated. And in this the study of oratory amongst the ancients partly consisted. Yet such an artificial product will always fail to reach the highest form of oratory. In support of this view is the fact, which will hardly be disputed, that the orator's success largely depends on his losing his self-consciousness. When I use the word "unpremeditated" it does not of course apply to the knowledge, information, thoughts and ideas of the orator, but to the language, the words and phraseology in which they are clothed and conveyed. And it does not affect the importance and benefit to the orator of his knowledge and study of language, and all other qualifications resulting from training, education and culture. Probably the younger Pitt stands pre-eminent in exhibiting the highest oratorical gifts at a phenomenally early age. Of his speeches Lord Stanhope says, "he did not prepare the structure or the wording of his sentences, far less write them down beforehand. The statement of his friends upon this point is much confirmed by his notes, as scattered amongst his papers." And his biographer proceeds to give examples of such notes, remarkable for their brevity; documents of surpassing interest to any one who has ever had to make speeches of any length, political or otherwise.

The effectiveness of unpremeditated utterance is sometimes very strikingly seen when least expected, as when a person is suddenly and unexpectedly called upon to speak, and on the spur of the moment expresses in a simple and unconventional manner some

sentiment on which he himself feels strongly, but has no thought of producing any striking effect on the audience. The puritanic revolt in the seventeenth century against fixed prayers, and the even stronger objection of the Quakers to anything even savouring of preparedness, illustrate the belief founded on experience that impromptu speech goes home to the hearts of the listeners in a way that which is prepared is unable to do.

That the highest form of oratory must be unpremeditated is supported by the fact that the greatest orators require an audience, and a sympathetic one, before them to call forth their powers. This is at once suggested by a comparison of their speeches with their literary productions. Had we only the writings of Erskine or Gladstone who would imagine that as orators they had risen to the highest flights of eloquence? Sitting down to compose in the solitude of the closet they were without that stimulus which was essential to call out those powers of weaving language so as to charm the ear and arouse the emotions, which were so conspicuous in the forum, on the platform or in the Senate. From the nature of the case it is obvious that the essential thing here could not have been premeditated, or it could equally well have been written as spoken. Moreover the greatest orators do not, cannot maintain the same high level throughout their speeches. Their highest flights of eloquence burst out every now and then as if under some sudden or passing inspiration, when they rise, as it were, for a time above the ordinary level of their discourse; and it is especially the character of these outbursts which distinguishes the great orator, moments often of supreme loss of self-consciousness when everything is forgotten in the subject or in the end the speaker desires to attain. "Eloquence," says Cicero, "blazes forth only now and then like a transient gleam, more frequently in some orators than in others." "Before a scanty audience," says Tacitus, "the orator's spirit droops, and the dulness of the scene damps the power of genius."

On the other hand, the most eloquent essay carefully prepared beforehand, when delivered by one wanting the orator's gifts may as a speech be an utter failure. Burke is perhaps the most striking example of this. He simply drove everybody away. This is well and amusingly described by Lord Erskine to the American ambassador, Mr. Rush, who had asked him about Burke's delivery:

"It was execrable," said he. "I was in the House of Commons when he made his great speech on American conciliation, the greatest he ever made. He drove everybody away. I wanted to go out with the rest, but was near him and afraid to get up; so I squeezed myself down and crawled under the benches, like a dog, until I got to the door without his seeing me, rejoicing in my escape. Next day I went to the Isle of Wight. When the speech followed me there I read it over and over again. I

could hardly think of anything else. I carried it with me and thumbed it until it got like wadding for my gun."¹

Moreover, the orator will be affected more or less by his audience, and this he cannot know with certainty beforehand. This was evidently in the mind of Cicero when he said, "The taste of the audience has always governed and directed the eloquence of the speaker, for all who wish to be applauded consult the character and inclinations of those who hear them, and carefully form and accommodate themselves to their particular humours and dispositions." The last sentiment of the celebrated Roman orator is one to which we may perhaps demur: it was no doubt an expression of that habit too common in the Roman forum, of studying too slavishly to conciliate the Bench. And this passage reminds me of a remark sometimes made, viz., that "the greatest orators can raise their audience to their own level." With limitations this is doubtless true. A speaker is no orator who ignores the nature and condition, the fundamental tastes, ideas, and even prejudices of his audience. The true orator instinctively discovers what these are, discovers the nature of the instrument before him, and then knows how he should play upon it. As long as he does not run counter to some fundamental feeling in his audience he can mould it to his will. He does this by gaining and holding their attention. When this is thoroughly done what does it mean? Simply that all ideas and trains of thought other than those presented by the orator are excluded, and the delighted listeners follow the speaker with ease, without effort, and are in a state of mind ready to hear, comprehend, and accept the views he eloquently presents to them. In this way many a one in the audience is literally carried away, and for the moment may believe what on cooler consideration afterwards his judgment will perhaps not permit him to accept.

It is in the presentation of noble sentiments, lofty ideals, and those simple deep instincts common to all humanity that the raising an audience to his own level is best attained: and the greatest orators alone possess the power of doing it. However clever, however learned, however facile in speech a man may be, unless he is endowed with a rich imagination and with the broadest and deepest sympathies he can never attain to this supreme oratorical eminence. But these great qualities even when accompanied by a meagre education may endow a speaker with a glowing eloquence which warms the hearts and inspires the minds of his hearers—witness the covenanter on the hillside, the miner in the wayside bethel, the *ouvrier* at a socialist meeting. It goes without saying, much of this depends on the subject matter of the speech. One subject may chill the

¹ I confess to some difficulty in following this anecdote, which is referred to by Lord Campbell and by Mr. John Morley, because, whilst this speech of Burke's was delivered in 1775, Erskine did not enter the House of Commons until 1783. The reference must have been to some later speech of Burke's.

faculties of the orator, another may call forth and arouse all the greatest powers, all the enthusiasm of his nature. Tacitus has well expressed this in the following passage:

"The importance, the splendour, and magnitude of the questions discussed serve to animate the orator. The subject, beyond all doubt, lifts the mind above itself; it gives vigour to sentiment, and energy to expression. Let the topic be a paltry theft, a dry form of pleading, or a petty misdemeanour, will not the orator feel himself cramped and chilled by the meanness of the question? Give him a cause of magnitude, such as bribery in the election of magistrates, a charge for plundering the allies of Rome, or the murder of Roman citizens, how different then his emotions! How sublime each sentiment! What dignity of language!"

Every speech may be considered from two points of view, viz. (1) What is said, including the words used and the order in which the words and phrases are placed. (2) How it is said, which may be conveniently spoken of as the manner of the speaker. And first as to what is said. This involves the consideration of the education of the orator. For the words a man will use on any particular occasion, the words which will rise most readily to his lips when called upon to express his opinions to others, will depend above all things on the language he has been accustomed to use, to hear, to read, to study, to admire. This education begins as soon as he is able as a child to speak. The acquisition in childhood of a clear elocution, a correct accent, grammatical expression, and a good choice of words means the retention and easy use of these invaluable characteristics ever afterwards throughout life. It is in this material of the orator that English speakers are, if I may venture to say so, deficient when compared with foreigners, largely due to the contempt with which the study of our language is treated throughout the education of Englishmen. It is in this that the French so excel us, and which to some extent explains the saying that every Frenchman is an orator. The importance of paying attention to speech in early life was strikingly put by Cicero when he said to Brutus:

"It is not so meritorious to speak our native tongue correctly as it is scandalous to speak it otherwise: nor is it so much the property of a good orator as of a well-bred citizen. It is a circumstance of great importance what sort of people we are used to converse with at home, especially in the more early part of life; and what sort of language we have been accustomed to hear from our tutors and parents, not excepting the mother. We have all read the letters of Cornelia, the mother of the Gracchi, and are satisfied that her sons were not so much nurtured in their mother's lap as in the elegance and purity of her language."

Having passed out of childhood and become the self-conscious student with power of choice, what studies are most suitable to make the man, when called upon to address his fellow countrymen, an orator? Undoubtedly first and foremost the study of literature. But what literature? The best authors of course, I hear some one

say. But who are the best authors? If I turn to our ancient seats of learning I shall be told that without a study of the ancient classics no one can pretend to a proper acquaintance with language. Without disparaging in the least the illustrious writers of Greece and Rome (in fact our so-called classical education gives to the majority of its students the mere drybones of language, and does little to disseminate a taste for, or knowledge of the immortal poetry, philosophy and history which it clothes), they must play quite a secondary part in any training which has for its object the expression of our tongue. The careful and interested study of our great writers from Shakespeare and Milton downwards is the preparation above all others most suited to give a speaker the full use and command of the best English. And I believe this is enough without any classical aid to enable a speaker to attain to the highest eloquence. In support of this I may instance two examples—John Bright and Lord Erskine. The school education of both these great orators was simple, and their later education chiefly dependent upon themselves. Erskine in fact at fourteen went to sea, and was for four years a midshipman. At eighteen he bought a commission in the army, and at twenty married, and for two years was quartered in the island of Minorca. His abundant leisure there he largely spent in “laboriously and systematically going through a course of English literature—Milton, Shakespeare, Dryden, and Pope.” And it was not until he was twenty-five years of age, after serving in the army and navy for eleven years, that he entered as a student at Lincoln’s Inn and went to Cambridge, where anything in the shape of classical study was conspicuous by its absence. Three years afterwards, in the year 1778, he was called to the Bar. It was undoubtedly this study of English literature which, as far as material in the shape of language was concerned, enabled him to become the greatest orator who has ever pleaded at the English bar.

But not only is my contention supported by this so striking an example; on principle it must be so. The man who studies with interest and with pleasure our great authors can enter into their spirit and assimilate their language in a manner and to an extent impossible with the writers of antiquity. The words, the phrases, the rhythm, the very music of their language find a mind receptive, sympathetic, enthusiastic, and become gradually so assimilated as to be part and parcel of his own eloquence, coming involuntarily, unasked, at any moment, to clothe in suitable, elegant, forcible or striking phraseology the ideas or sentiments he desires to convey to his hearers. A man may no doubt study Greek and Latin authors to such an extent as to be affected by them in a like manner, but with what result? His language has what is sometimes called a classical flavour. A comparison of the speeches of Gladstone and Bright illustrates what I mean; and the acknowledged superiority

of the latter in the highest flights of eloquence corroborates the views I have ventured to put forth.

But further, as far as language is concerned, the study of authors other than English, be they ancient or modern, is no advantage—I had almost said a disadvantage—because what I might call the language faculty of the orator is not distracted from that complete concentration on the study and use of his native tongue which tends so much to its mastery. And this accounts for what to some people seems so extraordinary, viz., that some of our greatest speakers knew practically no language save their own. Erskine is an example, for he was almost as ignorant of French as of Greek; and Disraeli is another. In fact, a study of many languages is apt to develop a critical faculty which is fatal to effective oratory. This was well put by Cicero in speaking of the Roman orator Calvus, of whom he said that “by being too minute and nice a critic upon himself while he was labouring to correct and refine his language, he suffered all the force and spirit of it to evaporate.” And I knew of the case of a most learned divine whose knowledge of Hebrew was so profound, yet so critical, that when preaching his difficulty in deciding on which word most correctly expressed his meaning was such as to make his sermons lose their force and interest.

The mention of the critical faculty recalls another point especially applicable to the present age, and which, to some extent, accounts for the dearth of the highest oratory. I refer to the spirit of introspection and analysis which the great and rapid progress of science has engendered. We are living in a subjective age; the only objectivity which appears to be of force—and it is, perhaps, sufficient for all the rest—is the pursuit of wealth. Subjectivity is the essence, is the friend of Philosophy; it is the enemy, the betrayer of eloquence. One exception will occur to many, the late Professor Huxley. How was his mastery of direct, clear, forcible English acquired? What do we know? That behind his great scientific work and colossal industry thereon, there lurked a really stronger literary taste. That his youth had been nurtured on Milton and the Bible, before the critical faculty had been fully aroused and cultivated. He is an exception which proves the rule.

The importance of this education of the orator becomes so apparent when we observe how the noblest thoughts and most elevated ideas fail to impress or even reach an audience when clothed in unsuitable, inelegant or unbecoming language. From a failure to realise this, or from too great a laziness to overcome the defect, many a speaker full of ideas fails to communicate them, and fails to be appreciated at his true worth. But is the converse true?—that mere words are of no effect unless they clothe some worthy sentiment which appeals to the audience, or convey to it some information?

This is one of the most curious and 'difficult questions' regarding oratory. We are apt to turn away with displeasure when we see some fluent speaker holding an audience simply because, as the saying is, he has the gift of the gab. That our ears are pleased by mere sounds if they be musical is obvious from the great appreciation of songs in languages which no one who hears them understands. A well-rounded period is often pleasing to the ear, altogether apart from any idea it conveys. And the difference between "applause" and "no applause" is no doubt often due to the effect produced by ending a sentence with a good sonorous phrase. Cicero was impressed with this, and instances a case where a Roman orator named C. Carbo, concluding a sentence with the words *Patris dictum sapientis, tunc meritis filii comprobavit*, was received with such an outburst of applause as to fairly astonish the critical Tully, who put it down to what I may call the sonorousness of the blessed word *comprobavit*; for if, says he, the order of the words is changed the spirit of them is lost. It is hardly satisfactory to say that mere sonorousness is a sufficient explanation. Is it not rather that the sympathy of the audience being already gained, or its understanding previously satisfied, it is in such a mood as to be ready to show its applause of the speaker when he adds anything, even a pleasing sound, to what he has already done to gratify his hearers?

There is a style of speaking in which eloquence, in the sense of appealing to the feelings or emotions, is altogether out of the question, *e.g.*, a legal argument or a scientific lecture. Yet there is abundant opportunity of exhibiting a command and choice of language, and a felicity or even elegance of expression. What an art lies here becomes very apparent when comparisons are made of different counsel arguing legal points in the courts of law, or of different scientific professors lecturing to their pupils.

Now let us turn to the second aspect of the subject—how the words are delivered by the orator. It is the question of the *manner* of speaking, using that word in its broadest significance. I may first ask a question which has often been asked before. Is the manner of the orator born in him or can it be acquired? Lord Chesterfield said: "A man must be born a poet, but it is in his power to make himself an orator; for to be a poet requires a certain degree of strength and vivacity of mind; but attention, reading and labour are sufficient to form an orator." The knowledge and use of language on which I have already dwelt may, no doubt, to a large extent be acquired by attention, reading and labour; but that the far more important manner which plays so great a part in enabling the orator to reach and move his audience can be artificially acquired may well be doubted. It is part and parcel of the man's constitution, for it must be absolutely spontaneous and natural to produce

the highest effects, and no movement or gesture purposely acquired in after life can have these characteristics.

A sound constitution, good elocution and clear enunciation, graceful and suitable action, a musical voice of wide compass, earnestness, sincerity and wide sympathies are all requisite to form the manner of the highest oratory. Although by combining all these we can imagine an ideal which is never completely reached, yet with such an ideal we can compare and judge the performances of different speakers. Humour, wit, antithesis, epigram, all add to the effect and power of the orator, yet they may all be present and true eloquence be absent. This emphasises the peculiar individualism of the orator's manner. It is something inseparable, inconceivable apart from the individual himself, something which defies analysis, and when separated from the orator vanishes like a vapour. How can you separate from the orator a manner characterised by a highly nervous temperament conjoined to a mind cool and temperate, such as is said to have characterised the eloquence of Demosthenes? A combination of such contradictions is only possible in that vital enigma a human body.

A speaker may by the clearness and logical force of his arguments convince his audience, but do little more; on the other hand, another speaker, by his manner and easy flow of words, may please but not convince. The true orator will do both these, but in addition he will rouse the emotions and stir the passions of those who listen to him. And this I take it is the best test we can make of oratory—how far does the orator combine and combine harmoniously the three-fold power of convincing, pleasing and stirring?

And firstly, to convince, a sound understanding and logical mind, aided by an extensive and appropriate vocabulary at instant command, clearness of expression and lucidity of exposition are the requisites. Education may do much for this part of the orator's equipment. The study of literature, cultivation of the memory and the methods of logic and science will constitute such an education. Of Erskine's celebrated argument in the King's Bench, in support of the rights of juries, Lord Campbell says: "It displays beyond all comparison the most perfect union of argument and eloquence ever exhibited in Westminster Hall." Higher testimony still, even when discounted by the partiality of friendship, is that of Charles James Fox, who said "it was the finest piece of reasoning in the English language." It at least convinced to such an extent as to bring about the passing of Fox's Libel Act. Of Erskine, one who had often heard him, said:

"In considering the characteristics of his eloquence it is observable that he not only was free from measured sententiousness and tiresome attempts at antithesis, but that he was not indebted for his success to riches of ornament, to felicity of illustration, to wit, to humour or sarcasm. His

first great excellence was his devotion to his client, and in the whole compass of his orations there is not a single instance of the business in hand—the great work of persuading—being sacrificed to raise a laugh or excite admiration of his own powers. . . . He forgot himself in the character he represented. . . . Earnestness and energy were ever present throughout his speeches, impressing his argument on the minds of his hearers with a force which seemed to compel conviction. He never spoke at a tiresome length, and, throughout all his speeches no weakness, no dullness, no flagging is discoverable; and we have ever a lively statement of facts—or reasoning pointed, logical, triumphant.”

And secondly, to please. What is it that makes a speech we listen to pleasing? I suppose ninety-nine persons out of every hundred who are pleased by listening to a particular speaker would not be able very clearly to explain what it was that gave them pleasure. A provincial barber who once entertained me with a discourse on oratory described Lord Rosebery (who had recently visited the town) as a pretty speaker, but by no means reaching the elevation of their chief local orator! I have heard a preacher described as being an acceptable speaker to his congregation. Voice, expression, gesture, wit and humour are characteristics which go to make a pleasing speaker, and when of an agreeable and striking nature, and all combined in the same person, make the orator irresistible.

The ideal voice is sweet and full, capable of the modulation requisite to express the tenderest sentiment or deepest pathos, to ring with scorn or tremble with emotion or passion. His voice, I take it, was one of the most powerful factors in the eloquence of Gladstone. Of Erskine's voice, Lord Brougham said—

“Then hear his voice of surpassing sweetness, clear, flexible, strong, exquisitely fitted to strains of serious earnestness, deficient in compass, indeed, and much less fitted to express indignation, or even scorn, than pathos, but wholly free from harshness or monotony.”

“The tones of his voice,” said a celebrated reporter who sat daily immediately behind him in court, “though sharp, were full . . . and adequate to any emergency, almost scientifically modulated to the occasion.”

Lord Campbell, who as a young man heard him with admiration from the students' box, says: “The exquisite sweetness of his diction, pure, simple, mellifluous—the cadences not being borrowed from any model, nor following any rule, but marked by constant harmony and variety.”

It is remarkable how the charm of the voice is disregarded or even worse by a class of speakers by whom it should be most cherished. I refer to the clergy of the established Church in this country, who have so largely adopted an affected tone of speech characterised by lifelessness and monotony. It has, no doubt, contributed to making their preaching unpopular amongst the masses of the people. How different from the sweet mellifluousness of

pulpit orators like Monsignor Capel and Père Hyacinth, or even the rugged naturalness of the present Archbishop of Canterbury.

Expressive and graceful gesture and suitable action, whether by movement of the head, the arms, or the whole body, have much to do in pleasing an audience. And nothing distracts more from that pleasure, makes it more difficult to listen to and follow a speaker than an awkward, angular, gawky action. It diverts rather than attracts attention from the words and sentiments of the speaker. To appreciate the full effect of gesture and action we must go to the Continent, for in these attributes our orators are undoubtedly deficient. The warmer blood of the Latin races calls it forth in much greater perfection. This is strikingly manifest on comparing the pulpit oratory of this country with that of France. What an extraordinary power to a speaker appropriate and graceful, yet forceful, action may lend, any one who heard at his best that consummate pulpit orator, Père Hyacinth, will readily admit. Of Eskine, Lord Brougham says, "Juries have declared that they felt it impossible to remove their looks from him when he had riveted and, as it were, fastened them by his first glance." "His action," says the reporter whom I have already quoted, "was always appropriate. Chaste, easy, natural, in accordance with his slender and finely proportioned figure and just stature." Gladstone's extraordinary power of being able to rouse vast audiences was, no doubt, due to, and would, I venture to think, have been impossible without, that extraordinary activity of body he exhibited on the platform on such occasions. Of the two great political rivals Fox and Pitt, it was satirically said, "the one (Fox) awes the air with his hands, the other with his whole body."

Wit and humour, if not overdone it goes without saying, please an audience. They relieve the tension and strain of listening, are a relief to overwrought feeling. Yet it is a curious fact that they are qualities not usually prominent in the greatest orators. Their great power to please is shown by the fact that almost alone, unaided to any extent by other oratorical gifts, they can make a speaker for a time always sure of his audience. It is remarkable how deficient modern politicians are in these lighter qualities. The passing away of Disraeli and Robert Lowe has left Sir William Harcourt almost the only prominent politician endowed with these gifts. This is, perhaps, not to be wondered at, for if any qualities deserve the name of gifts, and are born in a man, and can never be artificially acquired, they are assuredly those of wit and humour.

Thirdly, to rouse the emotions and stir the passions. This is the greatest of all oratorical gifts and the rarest. If Hume is to be trusted as an authority, English speakers in his day were wholly destitute of these powers, and he contrasts English oratory with that

of Greece and Rome in this respect. But he wrote before the age of Erskine, Pitt, Fox and Sheridan. What is it in the orator that gives him this power? Earnestness, sincerity, sympathy, imagination, but above all the power of placing himself in the position of others and entering into their feelings, sufferings, ideals and aspirations. He will be further aided by the power of concentration on some one great principle or object and bringing everything else to bear upon and illustrate it. Of Erskine, Roscoe said :

"In examining those particular qualities of Lord Erskine's speeches which contributed more obviously to their success, the most remarkable will appear to be the exact and sedulous adherence to some one great principle which they uniformly exhibit. In every case he proposed a great leading principle, to which all his efforts were referable and subsidiary—which ran through the whole of his address, arranging, governing, and elucidating every portion. As the principle thus proposed was founded in justice and truth, it necessarily gave to the whole of his speech an air of honesty and sincerity which a jury could with difficulty resist."

"The dervise in the fairy tale," said a critic particularly well fitted to pass an opinion, "who possessed the faculty of passing his own soul into the body of any whom he might select, could scarcely surpass Erskine in the power of impersonating for a time the feelings, wishes, and thoughts of others."

The passions of an audience may, of course, be moved by appealing to its prejudices or its selfishness. We cannot ignore the possibility of the appeal being made to the lower side of human nature. The orator must, therefore, also be judged by this standard—viz., how far he allows himself to descend to these means of working upon the feelings of his auditors, or how far he is able to guard himself against them, or how far the generous nature of his sentiments and his devotion to truth, liberty and justice render him incapable of being seduced into using them.

It is a fact worth noting that the kind of oratory which of all others should excel in appealing to the emotional nature of mankind—I mean pulpit oratory—is, generally speaking, so little appreciated. Many years ago Lord Brougham calculated that at least a million of sermons were preached every year in England. Probably double this figure would be less than the number now delivered. How few of these are thought worthy of publication, how much fewer even reach a second edition, how much fewer still are to any extent read even if published. In fact, as far as published sermons appeal to readers, they rank with abstruse works which are understandable only to a very limited number of persons, and they are a veritable drug in the second-hand book-trade. If we desire to find sermons which have survived as literature we must go back to Bossuet, Masillon and Fénelon in France, or to Channing in America, to Robert Hall or Chalmers in this country. The only sermons which are apparently at all widely read in this country, are

those of the late Mr. Spurgeon, whose weekly discourses are still said to sell in many thousands. Whatever opinion may be held regarding this preacher as an orator, he was certainly not lacking in that side of it which appeals to the emotions. This curious anomaly may perhaps be partially explained as being due to the fact that the sermons which are most carefully prepared are read verbatim from manuscript, as for example in the case of Canon Liddon or Dean Stanley, and are of the nature of read essays rather than orations; or, on the other hand, if delivered extempore are not prepared with such care as to make them worthy of a permanent record.

It may to some extent also be due to that defect from which the written record of all oratory suffers—viz. the absence of the individual presence, of the voice and gesture of the speaker. It is this which makes it so difficult to judge of and to compare orators who have passed away. This is even more strikingly observable in the case of those whose deliverances, at least as far as the words are concerned, are purely mechanical, as, for example, actors. The reputation of a deceased actor rests purely on the recorded opinion of those who heard him. He can leave no imperishable record of his own. Hence it is that so little that is certain is known of the actors of the past as actors, and that even of those who in their day were most distinguished there remains little more than a memory which becomes more and more hazy as that day recedes into the more distant past.

And with the orator it is especially his individual presence which plays so great a part in influencing the emotions and passions of his audience. This only those who heard him can thoroughly appreciate or understand. To some extent, therefore, myth and uncertainty must always invest the orators of the past, and unfortunately just in that which is most personal and therefore most interesting regarding them. We are perforce obliged to see them, to judge them through the varied, often contradictory media of those hearers who recorded their impressions—*quot homines tot sententiæ*, and we thoroughly appreciate the panegyric of an orator by a writer of antiquity—*Quanto magis admiraremini si audissetis ipsum*.

E. A. PARKYN.

WHAT IS CHRISTIANITY ?¹

READERS of Professor Harnack's lectures, which have been admirably translated into English by his friend Mr. T. Bailey Saunders, will probably be impressed with their simplicity and clearness; but they will not unlikely be disappointed with the absence of any very definite answer to the question on the title-page. When they have finished the reading of the book they will be inclined to ask, with increased emphasis, "After all, What is Christianity?" The fault is not Professor Harnack's, the vagueness is unavoidable. If the question were put in the form, What is a Christian? then Harnack has offered what to himself and many others is a definite and satisfactory answer, though we doubt if it would be considered satisfactory by the majority of those who call themselves Christians; but to the larger question no such answer is given. We talk about Christianity as though we clearly understood what is meant by the term, but when we are asked for a definition we find ourselves at a stand. No doubt many people would be ready enough to give their definition, but then we should find several definitions tendered which would not agree with one another. Catholics and Protestants would give different replies, and Evangelicals and Liberals would differ in their explanations.

Professor Harnack with great truth and vigour describes the characteristics of different historical forms of Christianity, such as Greek Catholicism, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism; but a review of their characteristics seems to reveal the fact that these are not so much three forms of Christianity as three different religions; though they all have some title to call themselves by a common name, as they all sprang, more or less, from a Christian origin, however little resemblance some of them may now bear to the original. They, perhaps, may also be entitled to be called Christian as they all profess to rest upon the authority of Christ; and the one element they cherish in common, in combination with their contradictory elements, is the ethics of the Gospel; though in putting the ethics into the second place and ecclesiastical institutions

¹ *What is Christianity?* Sixteen Lectures delivered in the University of Berlin by Adolf Harnack. Translated into English by Thomas Bailey Saunders. London: Williams & Norgate.

and dogmas into the first place, they contravene the first principles of Christ's teaching.

As there are thus several kinds of Christianity about, it is not easy for any one to say, in brief, what Christianity really is. Harnack's sketch of these historical religions seems to suggest an explanation of their differences, they are rooted in racial distinctions; there is, therefore, little prospect of reconciliation or unity, the idea of Christian reunion is wholly illusory. Christianity has never been one since it passed from the narrow circle of the first disciples out into the wider world. The predominance of the Orthodox Greek Church in the East, the Roman Catholic Church in the South, and Protestantism in the North and West, is not accidental, they appear to correspond broadly to the characteristics of the Oriental, Latin, and Teutonic peoples respectively; and are naturally agreeable to the populations amongst whom they were developed.

Professor Harnack naturally takes liberal Protestantism as his standard, and as being most nearly in conformity with the original Gospel. Farthest removed from this is the Orthodox Greek Church, upon which he is, therefore, most severe. In passing, we may remark, and it is a point to which we shall have to return, some obscurity is caused by Harnack's use of the epithet Greek, as certainly no less than three characteristics are thus described; they may all, perhaps, correctly be referred to a Greek origin, but the distinction between Greek traditionalism, Greek religion and Greek philosophy should have been pointed out. The most powerful agent in Greek Catholicism is ritualism. This kind of Christianity, if it deserves the name, can only be practised by means of ritual.

"Intercourse with God is achieved through the cult of a mystery, and by means of hundreds of efficacious formulas, small and great, signs, pictures, and consecrated acts, which, if punctiliously and submissively observed, communicate divine grace and prepare the Christian for eternal life."

And Professor Harnack very pardonably continues:

"There is no sadder spectacle than the transformation of the Christian religion from a worship of God in spirit and truth into a worship of God in signs and formulas and idols. . . . *It was to destroy this sort of religion that Jesus Christ suffered Himself to be nailed to the cross, and now we find it re-established under His name and authority.*"

How far the consciously deliberate aim of Jesus was to destroy ritualistic religion it is impossible to say, but that its destruction would have been the inevitable consequence of a general, sincere and intelligent acceptance of his teaching, we have no more doubt than Professor Harnack. It is clear from the Gospels that it was the contempt Jesus showed for their ceremonies and ordinances which

excited the hatred of the official or orthodox Jews and indirectly led to his crucifixion.

In his account of the rise of Greek Catholicism, Harnack, without we misunderstand him, falls into a striking inconsistency. He asserts that from the third to the sixth century this religion made an end of heathenism and polytheism and the gods of Greece really perished, not, however, without transferring a considerable portion of their power to the Church's saints :

"But what is more important, with the death of the gods, Neo-platonism, the last great product of Greek philosophy, was vanquished. The victory over Hellenism is an achievement of the Eastern Church on which it still subsists."

But only three pages further on Professor Harnack tells a different story :

"No one can look at this Church from the outside, with its forms of worship, its solemn ritual, the number of its ceremonies, its relics, pictures, priests, monks, and the philosophy of its mysteries, and then compare it on the one hand with the Church of the first century, and on the other with the Hellenic cults in the age of Neo-platonism, without arriving at the conclusion that it belongs not to the former, but to the latter. It takes the form, not of a Christian product in a Greek dress, but of a Greek product in a Christian dress. . . . In its external form as a whole this Church is nothing more than a continuation of the history of Greek religion under the alien influence of Christianity."

If this is the case, and we do not question it, where does the victory of Christianity over Hellenism come in? It is rather, in the case of this Church, the triumph of this particular kind of Hellenism over the Gospel. "It was in reality," as Dr. Hatch says, "a victory in which the victors were the vanquished."

Harnack considers that monasticism was the only saving element in Oriental Christianity; it provided a means for the cultivation of personal religion—the religion of experience—as opposed to that of tradition, doctrine and ritual. But this aspect of monasticism is a thing of the past, it has come under the paralysing influence of the Church with the usual consequences :

"Greek and Oriental monks are now, as a rule, the instruments of the lowest and worst functions of the Church, of the worship of pictures and relics, of the coarsest superstition and the most imbecile sorcery. Exceptions are not wanting, and it is still to the monks we must pin our hopes of a better future; but it is not easy to see how a Church can be reformed which, teach what it will, is content with its adherents finding the Christian *faith* in the observance of certain ceremonies, and Christian *morality* in keeping fast-days correctly."

After reading this section of the book, we are driven to the conclusion that it is useless to go to the Greek Church for an answer to the question, What is Christianity?

Professor Harnack is more complimentary to Roman Catholicism,

but we are not able to say we share his appreciation of this particular form of Christianity. Three elements he thinks he finds in the Roman Church—the Catholic, the Latin spirit (Roman World-Empire), and the Augustinian. Catholicism, with its non-Christian tradition, dogma and ritual, it shares with the Greek Church; but Harnack claims for it that it educated the Romano-Germanic nations. However much, he says, their original nature, or primitive and historical circumstances, may have favoured, those nations and helped to promote their rise, the value of the services which the Church rendered is not thereby diminished. On the contrary, we think the Church delayed their progress and that they would have educated themselves better without its interference. It was not until the German nations shook off the Roman yoke that their natural capacity for progress found full scope,

“they became independent, and struck out paths which it did not indicate, and on which it is neither able nor willing to follow them.”

The admission is surely significant. That Professor Harnack has not entirely freed himself from the conservative influence of the Church appears in what follows :

“The time, of course, is long past since it was a leader; on the contrary, it is now a drag; but, in view of the mistaken and precipitate elements in modern progress, the drag which it supplies is not always the reverse of a blessing.”

So in a measure the liberal Protestant professor bestows his benediction upon the institution which is still the enemy of freedom and enlightenment.

It is scarcely necessary to say that Professor Harnack's appreciation of Protestantism is intelligent and well-founded; that is, he grasps its essential principle of individual spiritual freedom.

“What do all our discoveries and inventions and our advances in outward civilisation signify in comparison with the fact that to-day there are thirty millions of Germans, and many more millions of Christians outside Germany, who possess a religion without priests, without sacrifices, without ‘fragments’ of grace, without ceremonies—a spiritual religion?”

But existing Protestantism is not without its defects, inherited from the Reformation, and necessitated by the circumstances under which it was born. The substitution of State churches for an ecclesiastical State was a great advance, but they have been the cause of a stunted growth; and they have aroused the “not unfounded suspicion” that the Church is an institution set up by the State, and accordingly to be adjusted by the State; if this is a fact, as it certainly is in England, why call it only a suspicion? Another drawback to Protestantism was that Luther, whom destiny forced to be not only a reformer, but also an intellectual and spiritual leader and teacher, was but imperfectly equipped for his task. { } He

had no means of obtaining a true historical acquaintance with the New Testament and primitive Christianity, and though he rejected some things, he retained others which had no connection with the Gospel, and was absolutely incapable of making any sound distinction between "doctrine" and religion. Thus it is that Protestantism has been burdened with doctrines and errors which are at the present day the source of considerable uneasiness to many minds. Protestantism set up a counter-church to Catholicism, but fell into the old error of asserting its claim to be the true Church because it had the right doctrine. As a consequence of the circumstances under which they were formed, and of what they have inherited, Dr. Harnack sees that the tendency is to Catholicise the Protestant Churches—they are becoming churches of ordinance, doctrine, and ceremony; but this tendency to revert to an earlier type is further helped by three powerful forces—the indifference of the masses; the liking of people to have something (external) that they can lean upon; and the State, which looks upon the Church as an instrument for maintaining obedience and public order. Here Professor Harnack utters a much-needed warning: "The Evangelical churches will be pushed into the background if they do not make a stand." Theology is not sufficient, firmness of Christian character is wanted even more. However unlikely it seems that Protestantism should degenerate into a new Catholicism, a religion based upon authority and depending upon ordinances, it should not be forgotten that it is possible as history shows—"It was out of such free creations as the Pauline communities were that the Catholic Church once arose." Still we do not think the Teutonic races will ever become "Catholic" like the Oriental and the Latin.

But the question, What is Christianity? still remains unanswered. We have thus far only seen something of the widely differing characteristics of the churches which are called Christian. We may be told that Christianity is in some way identical with the doctrine of the Trinity, or the sacrifice of the Mass, or a visible religious organisation professing to have Jesus Christ or his representative for its head; or non-ecclesiastics may say it is a certain spirit to be found in Western civilisation, or a social ideal. Such views are based upon the supposition that religion is a corporate thing, which it has generally been; but summarising Harnack's analysis we should say he rightly maintains that it is an individual characteristic; and that is why it is easier to say what a Christian is than what Christianity is; without we understand by Christianity simply the religion of a Christian man; which is, perhaps, the closest definition we can reach. On a broader scale Christianity would then mean the presence of Christian men, or the influence of Christian ideas, in a church or in society; we should then also see that Christianity is a quality of vague and fluctuating quantity in

the world. We thus reduce the question to what is a Christian? and the readiest way to find an answer is to go to the origin fount, the Gospels themselves. From these Harnack deduces that a Christian is one who believes that God is his Father and he himself God's child, and with this that religion consists in love, forgiveness, and brotherliness. Religion is not only a state of heart, but a deed as well; and Christianity is not only a particular frame of mind but also a particular course of conduct. Some men and women are Christians, but it is impossible to say that up to the present there has been any nation or society which deserves the name. As long as rulers and nations exhibit an unchristian spirit and conduct themselves and their affairs in an unchristian way, they are not entitled to be called Christian.

But this description of Christianity as individualistic, as a state of mind and a course of conduct independent of dogma and ritual, has long been familiar to us. What Harnack calls "religion itself" is exactly the same thing that Theodore Parker called "absolute religion" and the late Dr. Martineau "the religion of Jesus," meaning by that the religion which Jesus himself possessed and no more. So when Harnack says, "Jesus Christ was the first to bring the value of every human soul to light, and what he did no one can undo," we find only an echo of Emerson—"Jesus Christ belonged to the true race of prophets. He saw with open eye the mystery of the soul. Alone in all history, He estimated the greatness of man." And the same may be said of another sentence—"The value of a truly great man, as I saw it put lately, consists in his increasing the value of all mankind." It seems scarcely possible that Emerson's writings have only lately found their way into Germany. While referring to Emerson there is another passage in the Address which we have quoted which we would commend to the notice of Professor Harnack and others:

"Historical Christianity—as it appears to us, and as it has appeared for ages—is not the doctrine of the soul, but an exaggeration of the personal, the positive, the ritual. It has dwelt, it dwells, with noxious exaggeration about the *person* of Jesus. The manner in which His name is surrounded with expressions, which were once sallies of admiration and love, but are now petrified into official titles, kills all generous sympathy and liking."

It appears to us that Professor Harnack, in common with many other liberal Christians, though perhaps to a less extent, still retains something of this exaggeration about the person of Jesus. It is a pure assumption, with very little foundation, that when Jesus was addressing a few Galileans, in language which even they did not, always understand, he was addressing the whole human race in language that was sure to be misunderstood; or that when he was accepted as a leader by some Israelites, he was divinely ordained to be the leader, if no more, of all mankind.

So too when expressions of love, admiration and subservience were used about him, which were perfectly natural and appropriate when coming from an emancipated Jew or a converted polytheist, it is supposed to be the duty of all Christians to use the same language, however inappropriate; and to cultivate the same frame of mind, however impossible it may be to do so.

*Christianity as a religious force no doubt owed something to the personality of Jesus, to his sincerity and earnestness and his manifest desire to do good, as well as to the superiority of his teaching over that of the official teachers of his day, and this personal impression he created was immensely intensified by his crucifixion. Taken altogether, he aroused an almost unexampled enthusiasm amongst his immediate disciples—and in a measure they communicated their enthusiasm to those with whom they came in contact and to the next generation. But this personal enthusiasm naturally died away with the lapse of time and amongst people who knew nothing of Jesus himself except by report. And ever since, on the whole, Christian devotion has not been in any sense offered to Jesus of Nazareth, but to some creation of the imagination—the Messiah, or the incarnate Logos, or a God who had come down in the likeness of men. The original enthusiasm evaporated and the worship of a phantom took its place. It is impossible now to revive the personal enthusiasm for Jesus which existed amongst his early disciples, and rational Christians must be content with the teaching of the Galilean and the diffused and subtle influence which still lingers about the Gospel story. We cordially endorse Harnack's view of the essence of that teaching, which is the cream of the Law and the prophets, and is contained in the injunctions, thou shalt love God and thy neighbour; in the affirmation of Hosea quoted by Jesus, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice"; and illustrated in the story of the Good Samaritan, and enforced in the parable of the sheep and the goats. Whatever good Christianity has accomplished in the world has been due to the ethical teaching of the Gospel; whatever harm the Church has done has been due to its dogmas; and we fear that the Beatitudes have been more than counterbalanced by the Creeds.

These lectures by Professor Harnack were of a popular kind and in a large measure take for granted the results of modern historical criticism, and as the author is one of the best New Testament critics of the day, we feel we are in safe hands; yet the work leaves upon us an impression that is not quite satisfying. Speaking of early Christianity, Harnack says, regarding it as emancipation from Judaism, "So long as the words, 'the former religion is done away with' remained unspoken, there was always a fear that in the next generation the old precepts would be brought forward again in their literal meaning." Some one had to stand up and say, "The old is

done away with," and the man who did this was the apostle Paul. Harnack seems to lack the courage and energy to imitate Paul and affirm once again "that the old is done away with." He still, so it appears to us, retains some vestiges of the old; and orthodoxies, both old and new, see in this a chance of proclaiming that Professor Harnack is on their side. If consecrated forms of speech are retained they are vital germs from which reaction is sure to spring. Re-interpretation is always a failure, as the writer clearly sees.

"The endeavour seems to be succeeding; the temper and the knowledge prevailing at the moment are favourable to it—when, lo and behold! the old meaning suddenly comes back again. The actual words of the ritual, of the liturgy, of the official doctrine, prove stronger than anything else."

It is the natural result of putting the new wine into the old bottles. Orthodoxy cannot be reformed, it must be abolished or it will always revive; there must be no trace of it left to germinate.

The only important part of the New Testament Professor Harnack frankly discards is the fourth Gospel; this work, he says—

"which does not emanate or profess to emanate from the apostle John, cannot be taken as an historical authority in the ordinary sense of the word. The author of it acted with sovereign freedom, transposed events and put them in a strange light, drew up the discourses himself, and illustrated great thoughts by imaginary situations—only little of what he says can be accepted, and that little with caution."

The synoptic Gospels themselves "leave a great deal to be desired," though "they are not altogether useless as sources of history." From them Harnack says we can form a judgment as to what sort of person Jesus of Nazareth was, though he himself judiciously refrains from attempting to give any personal account of him. Considering the various and contradictory "lives" of Jesus which have been all based upon materials drawn from the Gospel, he is perhaps wise in leaving the subject alone. But this gives the origin of Christianity the appearance of being suspended upon nothing; it is neither "Jew nor Greek." The connection of the teaching of Jesus with Judaism, he says, is only a loose one, and it has no relation to the Greek spirit. On the contrary, we think it exhibits the process of Judaism being dissolved under the influence of Hellenism—not the kind of Hellenism which subsequently invaded the Church and gave us the Nicene Creed and priests and ceremonies, but the loftier and broader spirit of Greek philosophy. It is not necessary to suppose that Jesus was directly acquainted "with the thoughts of Plato or the Porch" even in a "popular redaction" (!) to have grounds for believing that he had come under their influence, without perhaps knowing from whence the influence had come. It was in the air. This Professor Harnack confesses, while illogically refusing to admit that Jesus could be affected by

For some reason he refuses to accept what, to us is almost conclusive evidence, though he provides it himself.

"One final point: the picture of Jesus' life and His discourses stand in no relation to the Greek spirit. That is almost a matter for surprise; for Galilee was full of Greeks, and Greek was then spoken in many of its cities, much as Swedish is nowadays in Finland. There were Greek teachers and philosophers there, and it is scarcely conceivable that Jesus would have been entirely unacquainted with their language. But that He was in any way influenced by them, that He was ever in touch with the thoughts of Plato or the Porch, even though it may have been only in some popular redaction, it is absolutely impossible to maintain."

This impossibility we entirely fail to see, but Harnack continues:

"Of course, if religious individualism, God and the soul, the soul and its God; if subjectivism; if the full self-responsibility of the individual; if the separation of the religious from the political---if all this is only Greek, then Jesus, too, stands within the sphere of Greek development; then He, too, breathed the pure air of Greece and drank from the Greek spring. But it cannot be proved that it is only on this one line, only in the Hellenic people, that this development took place; nay, it is rather the contrary that can be shown; other nations also advanced to similar states of knowledge and feeling; although they did so, it is true, only after Alexander the Great had pulled down the barriers and fences which separated the peoples. For these nations, too, no doubt it was, in the majority of cases, the Greek element that was the liberating and progressive factor."

After these admissions we cannot understand why Harnack should so emphatically deny even the possibility of Jesus being affected by the spirit which emanated from Greece and from Greece alone. Certainly the idea of Jesus reading the dialogues of Plato in a cheap and popular edition could never have entered into the head of any one, but there is no absurdity in supposing that Jesus was familiar with the story of the life and death of Socrates. We are so accustomed to the idea that only those who read become acquainted with the thoughts of others, or in any sense well informed, that we are tempted to forget it was not always so.

"The state of ignorance in which, among us, owing to our isolated and entirely individual life, those remain who have not passed through the schools, was unknown in those societies where moral culture, and especially the general spirit of the age, was transmitted by the perpetual intercourse of man with man" (Renan).

Neither was it through the school of Alexandria that the influence of Plato reached Jesus. Renan says:

"The frequent resemblances which we find between Him (Jesus) and Philo, those excellent maxims about the love of God, charity, rest in God, which are like an echo between the Gospel and the writings of the illustrious Alexandrian thinker, proceed from the common tendencies which the wants of the times inspired in all elevated minds."

But among the chief tendencies of the time was that which was due to Greek thought, and Jesus and Philo were both affected by it,

though on independent lines. Hence the resemblance between them without either being indebted to the other.

Platonism, as Walter Pater said, is not a formal theory or body of theories, but a tendency. The spirit of Platonism is its ideality; its unworldliness, the very antithesis of the worldliness of the Pharisees who had made religion a trade. "Philosophers," said Plato, "are lovers of truth and of that which is—impassioned lovers." And in this sense Jesus was near of kin to the philosophers. And Pater adds, "They are the corner-stone, as readers of *The Republic* know, of the ideal state—those impassioned lovers of that which really is, and in comparison wherewith, office, wealth, honour, the love of which has rent Athens, the world, to pieces, will be of no more than secondary importance." This aspiration after the ideal, the perfect, this love of the eternal reality is the key to the life of Jesus, but in his teaching it is naturally expressed in the terms of his own religion. Thus it is that non-Catholic or philosophic Christians always recognise in Plato a kindred spirit, though they may fail to realise that they have all along been his disciples.

In the Gospels we also find the spirit of the Stoics; their ethics, their acquiescence in the decrees of Providence, their cheerful submission to the order of the world, their return to nature or first principles. "Christianity is but a misunderstood Platonism"—"Christianity is Stoicism with a legend." Such things could not have been said without there had been a very near relationship. It appears to us then that Jesus had drunk, either consciously or unconsciously, from the Greek spring, preserving only from the religion of Israel that Theistic faith and those moral ideals to be found in the Psalms and the Prophets which could be harmonised with, and at the same time were modified by, the Hellenistic spirit. It must be borne in mind, as we have before pointed out, that two divergent streams proceeded from Greece—Greek religion with its liking for doctrine, ritual, and mysteries; and Greek philosophy with its ideality, its individualism, and its belief in the worth of the soul. It would indeed be a difficult matter to say who has not been indebted to "Plato and the Porch." For hundreds of years before Christ was born their influence had been spreading, and it is impossible to suppose that the broad, liberal, humane, religious spirit of the Galileans, amongst whom Jesus of Nazareth was born and bred, was not in a great measure due to their intercourse with educated Greeks. St. Paul seemed to have caught a glimpse of the truth, though it underwent a transformation in his philosophy of religion, when he said that the new man was neither Jew nor Greek. The characteristics of Jesus were due to the fusion of that which was best in Israelism and Hellenism, and the result was the production of a new type of character which in reality was neither

Jew nor Greek," and for which we can now find no other name than Christian. And those who think they find Hebrew elements in the Gospel and those who think they find Greek elements in it are both right, but to attribute it to either one of them to the exclusion of the other is to miss the only possible explanation of its origin. The affinity Christianity has always shown for Greek thought is a witness to its descent, and for our highest culture we still return to our spiritual ancestors. It is not easy to imagine how even Christianity itself could have bettered the man who spoke or wrote, whichever it was, the *Apology of Socrates*.

No one questions the influence of Greek thought upon Christianity in the first century and ever since. Why, then, should it be thought so incredible that this influence was at work in Galilee before the first century, and that it was an important factor in the evolution of Christianity? But this is to bring Jesus himself into the stream of historical development, and it is the fashion to represent him as the only man in the world's history who owed nothing to his inheritance and environment. It is an article of faith with most critics that it was St Paul who fused into one elements of Hebrew and Greek religious thought: thus Mr Joseph Jacobs says, "The Judaic Deity had to be Indo Germanised or Hellenised before He could become the God of Aryan Worship. This transformation, the outcome of the Pharisaic movement, was the great work of Saul of Tarsus and of the Alexandrian-pseudo-John." St Paul himself knew better, and gave the credit where it was due to Jesus of Nazareth himself. With Paul the process of formularising the new thought began, in Jesus it was free and unsophisticated. If Paul was the first to say "the old is done away with" he also recognised it was Jesus who did away with it. That Jesus himself was conscious of it Harnack has admitted by saying, "It was to destroy this kind of religion that Jesus Christ suffered himself to be nailed to the cross."

He and others who had drunk in the new spirit could not submit to the old forms, so when he was asked why his disciples did not fast like the Pharisees and the disciples of John, because said he, "no man puts new wine into old wine-skins." He struck at the very core of Jewish religion when he said, "The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath." And he affirmed the value of the soul in a spirit that was unknown to the Jews when he said, "There is something greater than the temple." This superb indifference to Judaism, springing up in its very midst, could only have been due to some influence from outside, and all the conditions lead to the conclusion that that influence must have come from Greece.

CHRISTIAN MYTHOLOGY

No intelligent critic can deny the fact that a considerable amount of mythology has crept into the Christian faith, which has, alas! proved itself a great trial to many who seek after truth. Some of this mythology is of heathen origin, and has been absorbed unconsciously into our creed by Christian poets weaving Scripture into the creation of their own fancy, until they have ceased to distinguish the one from the other. Milton is especially our great Christian mythologist: and although no one imagines his *Paradise Lost* to be a historic representation of facts, yet the splendour of his genius has done more to mislead the Christian mind on the subject of angels and devils, heaven and hell, than any known Christian poet. Milton, as the late Poet Laureate declared, "was the most highly educated and the deepest thinker of his time"; he was chosen as Latin Secretary to Cromwell on account of his learning, and was regarded by contemporary men of letters as a man "far in advance of the age." Yet it is remarkable how this man of profound thought and natural genius has led astray thousands of most thoughtful people by the grossly material character of his ethics and the fanciful spirituality of his physics, until the various Miltonic theories have actually formed a part of the Christian faith, and exist at the close of the most enlightened century the world has ever experienced.

It is the prevailing belief that Satan once dwelt in heaven, but having raised the standard of rebellion against God, he encountered the armies of the heavenly host which remained faithful to their allegiance. As the result of this angelic war, Satan and his fellow-rebels were defeated and hurled from the heights of heaven to sink for ever into hell. Such is the Miltonic interpretation of the text "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," and of a few other verses which I now intend to explain. This theory, poetically striking as it may be, is a most dangerous one causing endless difficulties, and being without Scriptural foundation should at once be banished from the teaching of Christianity. First, it implies the possibility of rebellion against God by those who have entered into an existence of which the ruling elements are love and peace; and, secondly, it suggests that heaven itself was the place from which all evil had its beginning. Astonishing as it may at first appear, I

venture to state without fear of contradiction from critical students of the Revelation, that God to man, that we may search in vain throughout the whole of the Bible for any safe foundation on which to rest the theory that Satan was ever in heaven. He is called an angel—and probably this has afforded the ground upon which Milton built his theory—but we must distinguish between angels of light and angels of darkness; between angels of life and angels of death. There exist, it is true, a few passages which at first sight appear to account for this singular misrepresentation; but these need but slight examination in order to show how incapable they are of affording ground for such a proposition. The first is (Is. xiv. 12), "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the Morning." This has no reference whatever to Satan, but applies to the King of Babylon, whose power and dignity are represented as having exalted him to heaven, and when that power was overthrown he is spoken of as being thrust down to the ground.

The next passage already alluded to, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven," is no more conclusive than the former. The original Greek runs: "I beheld Satan fall as lightning from heaven." It is true that Satan is here spoken of, and so speedy was to be his fall from power that our Lord compared it to lightning from heaven. This fall, Christ told His disciples, was to be the effect of their mission. The fall of Satan was to be from the position of power and influence over men because a greater power was about to make itself felt in the world—the power of God over Satan. In the same chapter the same figurative language is applied to Capernaum: "and thou Capernaum which art exalted to heaven shall be thrust down to hell." And we know that the fall of Capernaum was from power and influence to degradation and ruin. This passage therefore refuses to countenance the theory of the expulsion of Satan from the habitation of the world of spirits and the immediate presence of God. The passage, however, which is most generally quoted in support of this theory is to be found in the Revelation of St. John (Revelations xii. 7), "And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels fought against the dragon, . . . and the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent called the Devil and Satan." But this quotation is, if possible, less available than either of the others, not only because it is purely figurative, but because it refers neither to the present nor to the past, but to the distant future. "Come up hither and I will show thee things which must be hereafter." There was no promise of a representation of anything which took place before the existence of the first man upon the earth; but a vision of the hereafter, in which picture Satan is overcome—the great triumph of truth over error, of virtue over vice. With regard to the passage in St. Jude (verse 6) and

that in the Peter (2 Peter ii. 4) no mention of heaven so that neither of these can have any bearing upon the subject. With the notion therefore of peace and harmony with which we associate a life to come, we gladly banish, once and for ever, this Miltonic theory that sin and the father of sin had their origin in a world where evil cannot possibly exist.

JAMES WILLER.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

THE *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology*¹ places on record a large amount of useful ethnological work, and embodies a very complete monograph by E. W. Nelson on the Eskimo about Bering Strait. During the last few years the influx of gold miners into Alaska has materially modified the position and customs of the native tribes; but Mr. Nelson's observations and collections were made at a time when the Eskimo had had but little intercourse with Europeans, having begun in 1877. During a number of years the author resided in Alaska and had every opportunity of studying these interesting tribes, among whom he collected about ten thousand ethnological specimens. A large number of these objects are depicted in the volume before us, and give a clear insight into the domestic life and industrial capabilities of the Eskimo. Of special value is the collection of folk-lore, some of the tales being based upon historical facts, although it is not always easy to recognise their origin. It is greatly to be regretted that this interesting race appears doomed to extinction at no very distant date. The possession of rifles has enabled them to slaughter the animals upon which they rely for food at such a rate that famines are now of frequent occurrence. The diseases which civilisation always brings with it among savage races have undermined the vitality of the race, and claim even more victims than the former inter-tribal wars. Mr. Nelson's book will always remain a standard work upon the Eskimo, and will be read with pleasure by all who are interested in ethnology.

A very useful aid to chemical research has been published by the Patent Office² in the shape of a subject-matter index of the works in the Patent Office Library. The collection of works on technical chemistry is the best in the country, and, although it has always been provided with a good catalogue, it will be a great assistance to readers to have the present index. The headings of subjects are not too numerous and are well chosen, while the sub-headings of

¹ *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology.* By J. W. Powell. Part I. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1899.

² *Subject List of Works on Chemistry and Chemical Technology, in the Library of the Patent Office.* Patent Office, London. 1901.

the larger sections should render it easy for the student to find a work on any special subject.

Another little work calculated to lighten the labours of those who are in the habit of consulting foreign patent specifications is published by the same department in the form of a key to the classification of various foreign specifications.¹ There is much valuable scientific work in some of these specifications, especially those of Germany, and the English reader will find this key of great help in unlocking the intricacies of the eighty-nine classes and four hundred and forty-nine sub-classes in which the specifications are arranged. Denmark, Norway, and Austria have adopted the same system of classification as Germany.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

Evolution, and Its Bearing on Religions,² by A. J. Dadson, is an expansion of an earlier work by the same author, *Evolution and Religion*, which was published about eight years ago. This is rather a compilation than an original work. The first part is an account of the evolutionary theory, summarising the teachings of Darwin, Hneckel, Huxley, Romanes, and other *savants*. This is done with brevity and accuracy, and may be useful for those who have not read the works of modern evolutionists. Mr. Dadson, then, assumes that the evolutionary theory disposes of orthodox religious doctrines, in which he is justified, and gives a naturalistic account of the rise of Christianity and the Christian Church. It is all very correct, but not very new. Our author seems to think that Strauss and Renan were the first to attack the dogma of the deity of Christ. He appears to have forgotten Gibbon and Voltaire, Priestly and Paine, and the English Deists and Unitarians generally.

Dr. A. H. Japp³ has a very different opinion of Darwinism from Mr. Dadson. His book is a general attack upon the Darwinists—Darwin himself, Huxley, Grant Allen, and Herbert Spencer come in for a share of his criticism and often misplaced jokes. Darwin did not set up as an ethical teacher or human reformer, but simply as an honest inquirer after biological truth; and it is manifestly unfair to expect more of him than he claimed for himself. That Darwin's work was incomplete we do not doubt;

¹ *Key to the Classification of the Patent Specifications of Germany, Austria, Denmark, and Norway in the Library of the Patent Office.* London: Patent Office. 1901.

² *Evolution and Its Bearing on Religions.* By A. J. Dadson. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1901.

³ *Darwin considered mainly as Ethical Thinker, Human Reformer and Pessimist.* By Alexander H. Japp, LL.D., F.R.S.E. London: John Bale, Sons, and Danielsson.

but he established principles which are not affected by the imperfection of some matters of detail, nor is he to be condemned for the extravagancies of some of his followers. The social evolution of man, in which Dr. Japp appears to be especially interested, was outside the scope of Darwin's inquiries and is still a field for investigation, but the inquiry into its factors and conditions will have to be undertaken in a very different style and spirit from those exhibited by Dr Japp

Patriotism and Ethics,¹ by Mr. J. G. Godard, is more political than philosophical, and under cover of an ethical essay we are treated to criticism of the present Government and denunciation of the war in South Africa. Mr. Godard contends that patriotism is immoral, and like the love of money is the root of all kinds of evil. That many wrong things have been done in the name of patriotism we must admit, but so also have many evils been wrought in the name of liberty and religion; but this does not prove that religion and liberty are evils in themselves. Mr. Godard refuses to admit the usually acknowledged distinction between use and abuse, or the recognised disastrous consequences of the corruption of a good quality. He has no moderation; the thing in itself is bad if any evil has at times become indirectly associated with it. The love of one's own country does not necessarily imply the hatred of all others any more than a man's love for his own son leads him to wish mischief to befall everybody else's child. We suspect the genuineness of professions of love for all mankind when the claims of one's nearest kinsmen and neighbours are despised.

Patriotism, which Mr. Godard denounces, was the main part of the religion of the Hebrews, of which we are reminded by *A Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period*,² by the Rev. R. L. Ottley. We cannot help regretting the amount of labour and learning that is continually being expended upon this extraordinary people. It is usual to call them unfortunate, but we are not sure that they deserve the sympathy implied, for in many respects they may be considered fortunate. They have managed to persist and, on the whole, to thrive; and the ancient Hebrews are the only people who have been taken at their own valuation. They called themselves the chosen people, and others still believe they were. Mr. Ottley has nothing new to tell us; we do not see how he possibly could have, when scarcely a month passes without bringing us a history of the Jews. We sincerely wish that histories of the Greeks and Romans were as plentiful. Mr. Ottley, though evidently familiar with Biblical criticism, does not allow it to distract the reader's attention; he accepts "the ancient tradition for what it is

¹ *Patriotism and Ethics*. By John George Godard. London: Grant Richards, 1901.

² *A Short History of the Hebrews to the Roman Period*. By R. L. Ottley. Cambridge: The University Press.

worth." The early chapters of *Genetis* are treated with some freedom, but the rest of the book is little more than a well-written condensation and paraphrase of the historical parts of the Old Testament. To this is added a brief sketch of Jewish history from Nehemiah to the fall of Jerusalem, an Appendix on the Documents, an elaborate Chronological Table, and several good maps.

Books have their fortunes as well as men, and it may seem strange that while the popularity of the *Pilgrim's Progress* is unexampled Komensky's *Labyrinth of the World*¹ is comparatively unknown. Soon after the first appearance of the book Komensky's Church of the Moravian brethren was expelled from Bohemia and the book was consequently ignored, if not placed under a ban, amongst the only people who could read the language in which it was written. The book has had unusual trials, and has been more than once since forbidden or suppressed, why it is difficult to say, for though mystical it is not heterodox. We are indebted to Count Lutzow, not only for the translation of this remarkable work, but also for the introduction, which gives us a history of the book and an account of its author. In substance it is a picture of the world as known to the author contrasted with the ideal Christian state, and Count Lutzow tells us that Komensky was undoubtedly influenced by More's *Utopia* and Campanella's *Civitas Solis*. The pilgrim through the *Labyrinth of the World* describes with much zest and apparent fidelity and some humour the various orders of society, professions, and occupations, and finds little to approve of in any of them. There is no actual story as in the *Pilgrim's Progress* of Bunyan, but we are presented with a series of vivid and striking sketches. The pilgrim at last finds rest in the *Paradise of the Heart*, or inward and mystical Christianity. The spirit of the latter part of the book is very much in harmony with the *Theologia Germanica* and other similar religious productions of the period. It is a beautiful example of the preference of spiritual Christianity to that which was merely ecclesiastical or Catholic. We are grateful to Count Lutzow for bringing the *Labyrinth* within reach of English readers, from whom it should receive a cordial welcome.

Browning's poems resemble St Paul's Epistles in containing many things hard to be understood, and Mr A C Pigou, in his Burney Essay on *Robert Browning as a Religious Teacher*² has endeavoured to make them plain. The result is not particularly interesting, for if the Essayist's interpretations are correct, when Browning's verse is turned into plain prose it does not appear to amount to much.

¹ *The Labyrinth of the World and the Paradise of the Heart*. By John Amos Komensky (Comenius). Edited and translated by Count Lutzow. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

² *Robert Browning as a Religious Teacher*. Being the Burney Essay for 1900. By Arthur Cecil Pigou, B.A. London: O. J. Clay & Sons. 1901.

But this is unjust to Browning, for after all the essence of a poem is in the poetry, and if the colour and emotion of the poetry are subtracted what remains appears to be wanting in life. The Essay is a fairly good one of its kind, and that is as much as we can say.

We can heartily commend the Rev. R. M. Moorsom's attempt to introduce some of the hymns of other Christian Churches to English Churchmen; and we do this none the less sincerely because we are naturally not altogether in sympathy with the theological sentiments of many of the hymns included in *Renderings of Church Hymns from Eastern and Western Office Books*.¹ The renderings include several examples from the Greek, Eastern Syrian, and Armenian Churches, many of which have a stir and ring, and some of them a pathos about them which make them much more attractive than the commonplaces of most English Hymnals. Others from the Spanish, Italian, French, and German are scarcely less striking. But we confess to be more attracted by some of the hymns of the British and Anglo-Saxon Church, especially two attributed to King Alfred and Cynewulf's "Dream of the Holy Rood." Mr. Moorsom does not profess to give translations, but renderings, some of which are admittedly "free," as, for example, the verses on St. Kentigern (*Fulget clara festivitas*) which contains some very modern-sounding lines:

"Flower of Scotland's bravest chieftains:
Born to princely power and place;
Mark him mid the Glasgow burghers
With his gentle grace."

But this is an exception. In an interesting introduction Mr. Moorsom pays a deserved tribute to Dr. Neale and others who have made known to us some of the hymns of the Greek Church. The tunes, with two or three exceptions, are far less striking than the hymns, but Mr. Griffiths has succeeded in fitting singable tunes to a number of hymns of very unusual metres, and has thus rendered them of immediate service. We notice only one tune by Mr. de Winton, and that is excellent.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

Poverty and un-British Rule in India,² Mr. Dadabhai Naoroji, ex-member of Parliament for Finsbury, is an important work on an

¹ *Renderings of Church Hymns from Eastern and Western Office Books*. By the Rev. Robert Maude Moorsom. Music by the Rev. G. W. Griffiths and Mr. W. S. de Winton. London: O. J. Olay & Sons.

² *Poverty and un-British Rule in India*. By Dadabhai Naoroji. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1901.

important subject. When Mr. Naoroji commenced his agitation for reform of British rule in India some twenty-five years ago India was still regarded as a land of wealth, and although Mr. Naoroji's figures then published are now proved to be accurate, the country is still regarded as a preserve for snug appointments for our privileged classes, and all questions affecting India are, without doubt, considered by these classes solely from the point of view of their own interests. Whilst handsomely acknowledging India's great debt to England Mr. Naoroji contends that British rule is responsible for the present deplorable poverty of India. Whatever the cause, it seems incontestable that the average income of the nation is excessively low, that taxation is too high in proportion to its income, and that expenses of our rule constitute an enormous drain upon the country. By our public pledges we are bound, so Mr. Naoroji contends, to employ the natives in all departments of public life. In this view Mr. Naoroji is undoubtedly supported by the proclamations of the Crown and speeches by British statesmen. But apart from the ethics of the question is it good policy to ruin the country in order to run India in the interests of a single privileged class? At present, India takes from us 2s 6d. per head in exports. Mr. Bright once said: "You can govern India if you like for the good of England, but the good of England must come through the good of India. There are two modes of gaining anything by our connection with India: the one by plundering the people of India and the other by trading with them." We have tried the first alternative for one hundred and fifty years, and we are now beginning to reap the results in a poverty-stricken, plague-stricken, and famine-stricken dependency. Place the country, says Mr. Naoroji, on a sound economic basis, employ the best native talent and energy, place India in a position to buy English goods to the extent of £1 a head—a small amount compared with other countries—and our export trade with India would equal our present trade with the whole of the rest of the world. Thus a policy of justice would be found to pay best, a combination which ought to appeal successfully to the modern money-grubbing Englishman. The question of admitting natives to commands in the English Army and Navy is too controversial to discuss here. Theoretically, Mr. Naoroji appears to us to have cornered Lord Lansdowne and Mr. Goschen. But to give natives commissions in the English Army or Navy is still impossible. In the Indian Army it is different. It would, in our view, be wiser to allow the native officer the chance of rising to the rank of a field officer. To trust up to a certain point and no further is sometimes even more dangerous than to trust fully. On the economic side Mr. Naoroji has entirely omitted to examine the land subject, and that important question so intimately bound up with it, that of money-lending. These two have contributed

most materially to the downfall of the peasantry. The recent legislation to meet the latter evil should have some beneficial effect. After making all due allowance for Mr. Naoroji's natural bias enough remains to create serious misgivings as to the ultimate result of our rule unless very drastic alterations are effected. Whether we like or not we must face the fact that India is getting poorer. When we have bled her to death what is to be the next step?

As might be expected Vol. xxxii. of the *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*¹ is largely devoted to South Africa and China, although other possessions are not neglected. This volume opens with a short paper by Lieutenant-Colonel Sir Gerard Smith, entitled "Recent Observations in Western Australia," to which those who are interested in gold mines will turn. "The Islands and the People of Fiji," by Dr. Finucane, medical officer of the colony, is valuable as showing the progress made during the last decade. In his paper on "Recent Progress in Victoria. With Observations on the Defence Forces," Lord Brassey offers the Government some valuable advice, whilst Major A. St. Hill Gibbon, the well-known African explorer, gives us the results of his experience of "The Nile and Zambesi as Waterways." The most important articles are, without doubt, the following: "The Expansion of Trade with China," by Mr. T. H. Whitehead, a Hong Kong banker, who gives a lucid and comprehensive account of the present state of affairs in China. In the discussion which followed Mr. Yerburgh, M.P., Mr. Joseph Walton, M.P., and Mr. Moon, M.P., made some useful observations. In his paper on "Agriculture in South Africa," Professor Robert Wallace confirms the views expressed by us in the pages of this REVIEW. The outlook for agriculturists is not encouraging where they have to depend on irrigation. He admits that in India several millions of acres are thus cultivated, but then the people are intensely industrious and have carried on this system for centuries, and even now, in years of plenty, obtain little more than a bare subsistence, and periodically endure all the miseries of famine. South Africa should be compared with America where irrigation has, on the whole, been very unsatisfactory, the supply being so limited that it requires to be applied with such infinite care and skill that the cost becomes prohibitive. Of equal value is "Basutoland and the Basutos," by Sir Godfrey Langden, one of the most successful colonial administrators we have ever possessed, and now so wisely appointed Native Commissioner for the Transvaal. As the Hon. John Tudhope truly said, the Crown Colony system will neither suit Europeans nor natives now or at any future time, the one remarkable exception being Basutoland. It is a pity Mr. Chamberlain was not present at this lecture, when he might have learned something to his advantage.

¹ *Proceedings of the Royal Colonial Institute*. Vol. xxxii., 1900-1901. Edited by the Secretary. London: The Institute, 1901.

The *First Supplementary Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Colonial Institute*¹ is a substantial proof of the enormous and increasing growth of the library since 1895. The first catalogue ran to about 700 pages, whereas the present volume has 800. The same system has been followed. We have first an index of colonies with the various subjects relating to each, then an index of authors, a catalogue of voyages and travels, and finally the works relating to each colony separately catalogued as they were received year by year. By cross references an author or a subject can be instantly found. Used in conjunction with the first catalogue, ready access is thus given to some 44,000 volumes and pamphlets all relating to the colonies and India. The pamphlets largely consist of magazine articles, amongst which we notice a very considerable number from the WESTMINSTER REVIEW. This method of preserving magazine articles, which are frequently of greater value than more pretentious works, cannot be too highly commended. These catalogues, as the librarian truly points out, will prove not only a guide to the literature of the colonies and India, but a valuable work of reference to their history, trade, government, and development.

We have not had the patience to read more than a few pages of *The Time of Transition: or, The Hope of Humanity*,² by Mr. Frederick Arthur Hyndman, an Oxford graduate and a Barrister-at-Law. For shallow thinking, slipshod English and hackneyed truisms, this book would be hard to beat. On the first page of Chapter i. we are informed that "the writer is one of those who is convinced that religion suffers from anything like a tricky theology." What this exactly means we confess our inability to determine, but as an example of this deep saying, we are told that whilst it is true to announce that all men are equal before God, it is not true to assert that all mankind are equal to one another. Mr. Hyndman is also convinced that the science of religion is the science of sciences. Mr. Hyndman may know a great deal of religion, but he knows absolutely nothing about science and is consequently totally incapable of comparing the science of religion with any other science. His attempts to explain Biblical phenomena scientifically are simply ludicrous, and his theological views are so childish and grotesque that even the orthodox will be shocked unless they treat them with contempt. Of sociology Mr. Hyndman is absolutely ignorant. As a Barrister-at-Law he should know better than to make astounding statements for which there is not a tittle of evidence. We are only surprised that an eminent firm like Messrs. Swan Sonnenschein & Co. should have been induced to publish such a farrago of nonsense. It reflects little credit on author or publisher.

¹ *First Supplementary Catalogue of the Library of the Royal Colonial Institute.* Compiled by James R. Booc, Librarian. London: The Institute. 1901.

² *The Time of Transition: or, The Hope of Humanity.* By Frederick Arthur Hyndman. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1901.

Master and Slave,¹ by Mr. Alfred T. Story, is a pathetic tale of agricultural life in its sorriest aspect. In those districts where the farmers own all the cottages—and such districts are by no means uncommon—the relationship between employer and employée is best described as that of master and slave and can only be compared with the white slavery of the early factory days. The author's preface contains one line: "This is no idle imagination that I write," and any one with any knowledge of the conditions we have named will recognise that this narrative thrown into fictional form is drawn from life. That English men and women should with all our boasted civilisation be ground down and treated worse than cattle by ignorant boorish farmers makes one blush for the good name of our country, but until the agriculturists combine on trade union lines we see no help for them.

Under the able editorship of Mr. Charles L. Attenborough Harris' *Criminal Law*² has retained its position as the popular textbook on this branch of law. The fact that since December 1898 only two statutes of any importance affecting the criminal law have been passed is some evidence of the decrease of crime. One is the Larceny Act, 1901, which comes into force next January and which amends sections 75 and 76 of the Larceny Act, 1861. By those sections the embezzlement by agents and persons entrusted with goods and money was confined to bankers, merchants, brokers, attorneys, or agents. The new statute extends the offence to all persons entrusted with any property for safe custody. The other statute, the Youthful Offenders Act, 1901, received the Royal assent so late that it was found impossible to incorporate its provisions in the text and Mr. Attenborough has therefore been compelled to describe them in the preface. We need scarcely add that the present edition has been carefully brought up to date. The last edition was the first which came under Mr. Attenborough's hands when he reduced to order what had become through numerous editions somewhat chaotic. We can only repeat the very favourable opinion we then expressed.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

EAST Frisia, or *Ost-Friesland*, is almost a "terra incognita" to the modern tourist; and yet this land had a stirring history. It is a

¹ *Master and Slave*. By Alfred T. Story. London: R. Brimley Johnson. 1901.

² *Principles of the Criminal Law*. By Seymour F. Harris, B.C.L., M.A. (Oxon.). Ninth Edition. By Charles L. Attenborough of the Inner Temple and Midland Circuit, Barrister-at-Law. London: Stevens & Haynes. 1901.

flat and fertile stretch of country bordering on the North Sea. It is only a four hours' journey from Bremen or a day's journey from Cologne. The ancient Lordship of East Frisia is now a part of the Kingdom of Prussia; but the careers of Count Ulrich and his successors of the House of Cirksena deserve to receive some attention from the historian. Mr. W. P. Dodge has, in his admirable book *From Squire to Prince*,¹ written a history of the race of warriors who, between 1441 and 1625, swayed the destinies of East Frisia. As the author remarks: "There is something pathetic in the contemplation of this vanished state." However, the House of Cirksena accomplished its destiny before its disappearance from the scene. The Counts of East Frisia appear to have been benevolent despots, and, on the whole, they tried to promote the welfare of the people. As the Frisians have from the earliest times been possessed by a strong love of liberty, they would probably have shown no toleration to any absolute power which was tyrannically exercised. The Cirksena family were originally country squires or chiefs of the district. The feuds in which other powerful families were engaged resulted in a rise to greater power on the part of the Chief of Gretzel or Cirksena, as the family was indifferently called. The members of this ennobled house of country gentry were not very scrupulous during the Reformation period, for one of them, Enno II., boldly appropriated some of the treasures of the monks. We can scarcely agree with Mr. Dodge in the analogy which he finds between the Cirksena in Frisia and the Medici in Florence. The Cirksena were squires who were ennobled, while the earliest members of the House of Medici were merchants. The volume should interest all who love the by-paths of history. It contains some very curious facts, which the industry and research of Mr. Dodge have brought to light. The last of the Counts of East Frisia, Carl Edzard, "committed the one unpardonable sin in the eyes of his people, the failure, though married, to give the country an heir"—we are quoting the author's pregnant words. East Frisia was held by Prussia till the conquest of Prussia by Napoleon. Since the battle of Sadowa it has again become a part of Prussia. But the East Frisian still attaches to the name of his town the words "Ost-Friesland"; and it is impossible to predict that so sturdy a race may, under all circumstances, continue to be loyal to the blood-and-iron empire of which Bismarck was the maker.

The translation of Miss Clara Tschudi's biography of the late Empress of Austria² will be read with feelings of deep emotion by all who admired that beautiful, brave, but unfortunate lady. Elizabeth, Empress of Austria, was all her life a child of Nature, a

¹ *From Squire to Prince*. Being a History of the Rise of the House of Cirksena. By Walter Phelps Dodge. London T. Fisher Unwin.

² *Elizabeth, Empress of Austria and Queen of Hungary*. By Clara Tschudi. Translated by E. M. Cope. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

hater of anams, and a lover of her fellow creatures. The forms and ceremonies of Court life were hateful to her. Her devoted attachment to Hungary, whose political rights she cherished, shows that in her heart the worn-out principles of autocracy found no place. How futile and senseless, therefore, was the cruel stroke of the assassin which removed one of the most natural, most fearless, and most liberty-loving women that ever lived. Miss Tschudi's delightful volume vividly brings before us the entire career of the Empress, from her strange girlhood up to the time of her tragic death. The English version of the work is not free from blemishes. For instance, in a passage referring to her failing health, we are told that "she was far *more suffering* than was generally supposed." But the difficulties of rendering Norwegian into English can only be realised by those who have tried the experiment; and, with the slight qualification just mentioned, the translator has accomplished a trying task with great care and success.

Dr. George C. Williamson¹ has written an excellent biography of the great Italian painter, Francia. The fact that, with the exception of Vasari's life of the painter, there is only one other available for the English reader—Mrs. Ady's *Mantegna and Francia*—is in itself a justification for the appearance of Dr. Williamson's work. It appears that much fresh information concerning Francia's pictures has recently been discovered, and for this reason it is a fitting time for publishing a new biography of the artist. There is some uncertainty as to the date of the painter's birth. Vasari gives the date as 1450. Calvi, in his short life or sketch of Francia, leaves the matter in doubt, though it seems probable that the birth of the artist took place between 1448 and 1451. His parents are described as artisans in Vasari's life, though the family was an old one in Bologna. Francia was a versatile artist. His work as a goldsmith was genuine art, and he was a splendid portrait painter. His altarpieces are rather conventional in treatment, and their technique is, as a rule, more admirable than their conception. But the accessories of some of his pictures—such as birds, trees, and flowers—are marvellous in their beauty of detail. It is, perhaps, more accurate to describe him as an accomplished than as a great painter. He takes a place towards the close of the Renaissance as a Christian artist—in fact, as a votary of a decaying cult. As such, he is entitled to a prominent place in the history of Italian art. He was apparently untouched by the influences of the Pagan literature which moulded greater minds than his. He, therefore, occupies a place apart. In reality, faith in Christianity has been steadily dying out in Italy since the Renaissance. Francia is an exponent of Christian art in its conventional aspects. His best work gives

¹ "The Great Masters in Painting and Sculpture" Series *Francia*. By George C. Williamson, Litt. London: George Bell & Sons.

expression to the ideas and sentiments of a disintegrating creed. His life and his work are interesting because they furnish, perhaps, the best example of the conventional Catholicism of Italy in the fifteenth century.

Professor Pasquale Villari has in his deeply learned book, *The Two First Centuries of Florentine History*,¹ thrown much light on the origin and political development of the marvellous city associated with the great name of Dante. The author in his preface acknowledges that the work consists of different lectures, some of which are separated in order of date from the others by a long interval of years. But the book still possesses organic unity, and its historical importance cannot be questioned. Professor Villari discusses at great length the origin of Florence, which is involved in some obscurity. It is quite evident that the Florentines were always lovers of liberty, and the part which the Republic played in Italian history was a great one. The work has the additional merit of showing that Italian "Comunes" were the preservers of political freedom. They withstood the tide of barbarian tyranny. The Latin race, trampled beneath the hoof of the destructive Teuton, still retained the traditions of Roman law, the sacred rights of civilisation, and as the Italian Republics gave Europe a protection against despotism in the Middle Ages, it was France at the time of the Revolution which emancipated the proletariat. England's political struggles were really only a war between the Crown aided by the aristocracy and the middle classes. The readers of Professor Villari's work will see how, in spite of the many crimes which stained its history, Florence may justly lay claim to be one of the great civilising cities of Europe. As regards the style of the translation, the principal fault we have to find with it is that it is full of split infinitives. From a historical point of view it is one of the most important works on Italian history that has recently appeared.

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. BARRY PAIN is a humorist who sees a great deal of comicality in dialectical peculiarities. In his little book, *De Omnibus*, by the Conductor,² he makes a 'bus-conductor indulge in the most amazing garrulity. The chapters on "The Last 'Bus" and "At Home" will amuse Londoners, but it is exceedingly doubtful whether any 'bus-

¹ *The Two First Centuries of Florentine History*. By Pasquale Villari. Translated by Linden Villari. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

² *De Omnibus*. By the Conductor (Barry Pain). London: T. Fisher Unwin.

conductor ever talked in this fashion. Mr. Barry Pain has, we fear, evolved the conductor's supposed reminiscences out of his own inner consciousness.

*The Child at Home*¹ is a little volume containing two excellent essays by Mrs. Clement Parsons. Her views as to the education of children deserves careful attention. She considers that an only child should be induced to cultivate the society of other children. In dealing with "The Beauty of Simplicity," she maintains that simplicity is not merely the path of light, but the path of right. There is much food for thought in this attractive little book.

Mr. John Pennie, jr., has shown considerable grasp of the spirit of antiquity in his exceedingly remarkable volume, *Orpheus and Euridice*.² The author, who is English by birth and American by adoption, has found time, in the midst of absorbing mercantile pursuits, to present the world with a version of Homer's poem on this romantic theme, which indicates a minute and scholarly knowledge of Greek mythology. At the same time, it must be acknowledged that there is a certain incongruity in the singing of Greek hymns to such modern tunes as "Isle of Beauty" and "Bonny Doone." Mr. Pennie imports too much modernity into this story of ancient Greece. However, his enthusiasm and his appreciation of Greek ideas should find for him many readers in England as well as in America. Some of the illustrations are very striking, from an artistic point of view.

Mr. Nisbet Bain's collection of *Tales from Tolstoi*³ must have a deep interest for all admirers of the greatest living Russian—and their name is legion. The volume contains a biography of Count Tolstoi—or, as we prefer to spell the name, Tolstoy—which gives a very appreciative account of the author of *War and Peace* and *Anna Karenin*. It is really impossible during his own lifetime to do justice to the moral and spiritual greatness of one who is, at the same time, an apostle, a social reformer, and a man of genius. The tales in the volume are not all of equal merit. The first of them "Master and Man," is a very favourable specimen of the author's genius. The simplicity of the style has a certain grandeur from the very fact that the story deals with nature in some of its primitive aspects. The description of the death of Vasily Andreich in the snow is one of the finest things in all literature. On the other hand, such stories as "Where Love is there God is Also," and "What Men Live By" are nothing better than tracts written to support the Tolstoyan philosophy of life. Like most enthusiasts for a simple code of morality Count Tolstoi is illogical. He lays down

¹ *The Child at Home*. By Mrs. Clement Parsons. London: J. Nisbet & Co., Ltd.

² *Orpheus and Euridice*. A Grecian Tragedy. Plato's Version. By John Pennie, jr. Illustrated. Albany, N.Y.

³ *Tales from Tolstoi*. With Biography of the Author. By R. Nisbet Bain. London: Jarrold & Sons.

the principle that every man's duty is to obey the will of God. But when we ask: "How are we to discover what is the will of God?" we are told to read the New Testament. Then we are further asked to interpret it from a purely Tolstoyan point of view, with the result that we are to condemn war as a crime and to adopt practical Quakerism as our ethical law. In many of these tales written for peasants, or at least for the masses, the didactic element is too prominent. If St. Francis de Sales had turned novelist, he might have written tales just as didactic and unsophisticated as some of the tales in this volume. But, in spite of their defects, the genius of the man, his originality, his intense humanness can be traced on every page. Mr. Bain has done the work of translation admirably, though he often uses the word "thou" or "thee" where "you" would be more suitable. The photogravure portrait of Count Tolstoy is really excellent. Messrs. Jarrold and Sons have by the publication of this fascinating book enabled English readers to form an estimate of what may be called the popular side of this great writer's genius. Of course, if we wish to see the greatest products of Count Tolstoy's creative power, we must read *War and Peace*, *Anna Karenina* and *Resurrection*. But in these tales we see his attitude towards the much-misunderstood Russian muzhik and towards the life and institutions of his own country.

*The Age of Chaucer*¹ is an admirable handbook dealing in a lucid style and in a highly critical spirit with one of the most important periods in the history of English literature. Mr. F. J. Snell has proved that he has studied the historical as well as the literary environment in the midst of which the poet grew up. The introduction contains some rather crude generalisations, e.g., the statement that "the post-Norman Conquest Englishman was after all essentially the same being as the pre-Norman Conquest Englishman." Mr. Hales, the learned editor, takes a very superficial view of this question. The Normans and the Saxons may have both been technically Teutons, but in their history, their habits, and their associations they were entirely different. Chaucer had in him more of the Norman than the Saxon ingredients. Certainly the French element is to be found very largely in the form of some of his poems. The chapters on English prose in the age of Chaucer and on Gower, the author of *Confessio Amantis*, are full of useful information and will be invaluable to students of the period.

Mr. Brimley Johnson has published a volume of delightful short stories—*The Rainbow Garden and Other Stories*—by Gratiana Chantoy.² The tales have all the charm of fairy tales, and there is a thread of exquisite fancy running through them. Perhaps the

¹ *The Age of Chaucer*. By F. J. Snell, M.A. With an Introduction by J. W. Hales. London: George Bell & Sons.

² *The Rainbow Garden and Other Stories*. By Gratiana Chantoy. London: R. Brimley Johnson.

melancholy note predominates too much in these little stories, which are apparently intended for children. We live in an age when there is a great deal to make even strong men weep, and we need a little more healthful laughter. But the writer of this volume of tales has certainly the gift of touching the heart. It is a great gift, and she must be congratulated on the possession of it, even though she writes in a strain of almost unbroken sadness. The book is beautifully printed; and its pages will be grateful to tired eyes. The illustrations are very pretty.

*Zwölf Jahre im literarischen Kampf*¹ is the title of a volume of interesting criticism by Eugen Wolf. The subject of the German drama is elaborately and ably dealt with, and full justice is done to such men as Sudermann. The closing essay in the volume, "Eine naturalistische Literaturgeschichte," will interest all readers who have followed the development of the naturalistic movement in modern literature.

*Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*² by Heinrich Bulthaupt, is a very important edition to contemporary German literature. Herr Bulthaupt shows a very extensive acquaintance with the subject. His criticism of Goethe as a dramatist is masterly. He gives Schiller, perhaps, too high a place in German dramatic literature. Schiller's plays are too idealistic, too much permeated by what may be called boyish views of life. A man who contended that "death is not an evil because it is universal" can scarcely be taken seriously. This work will be of immense service to all students of German literature.

*Briefe aus Rom und Athen*³ is an interesting series of letters presenting a vivid picture of Rome and of Athens at the date of the correspondence (1850-51). The work is valuable from a historical and critical standpoint, and it is refreshing to find, as we do in this little volume, such a keen appreciation of Italian art.

POETRY

MR. EDWIN EMERSON⁴ is a poet who possesses very little originality. His subjects are commonplace, and he has dealt with them in a very

¹ *Zwölf Jahre im literarischen Kampf*. Studien und Kritiken von Eugen Wolf. Oldenburg und Leipzig: Schulzische Hof-Buchhandlung und Hof-Buchdruckerei. A. Schwartz.

² *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*. Von Heinrich Bulthaupt. Achte Auflage. Oldenburg und Leipzig: Schulzische Hof-Buchhandlung und Hof-Buchdruckerei.

³ *Briefe aus Rom und Athen (1850-51)*. Von Freiherrn Reinhard v. Dalwigh zu Schleifels. Herausgegeben von seiner Tochter. Oldenburg und Leipzig: Schulzische Hof-Buchhandlung und Hof-Buchdruckerei.

⁴ *Poems*. By Edwin Emerson, M.A. Denver, Colorado, The Carson Harper Company.

commonplace fashion. The most that he can say of friendship is this:

"Yea, 'tis the glory of the mind,
It has the power to know and find
Its kindred spirit, true and kind,
To mutual confidence inclined,
Oh! rare and happy gift

This is certainly inferior to Dr Johnson's well-known lines on friendship.

ART.

LOVERS of the ceramic arts should be pleased with the handy little book of one hundred and thirty-two pages, in which are reprinted the *Notes on Pottery Clays*,¹ contributed years ago to a technical journal by the late James Fairie, "a painstaking and practical geologist." The literature of this subject is, indeed, limited in English, and yet these notes treat largely of English clays—Dorsetshire and Devonshire, Cornish china, and Irish porcelain. The distribution, properties, uses, and analyses of ball clays, china clays, and china stone are described with great clearness, and it is astonishing how much information of general interest, even for the non-technical mind, is communicated by the way. The three chapters on Chinese Kaolin and Petuntze, and the comparison with European clays are of elementary necessity for those who wish to study intelligently the fascinating and easily accessible European collections of Chinese porcelain. On page 112 a curious solution of the Irish question is given in a single sentence of twenty-five lines!

During the vacation season there have accumulated on the reviewer's table a half-dozen of the latest issues of "Bell's Cathedral Series."² Many of the previous volumes have been noticed here, with uniform praise for the results of a plan well organised from the beginning. This plan has been closely followed in the present books. If there is any change it is in the superior excellence of the photographic reproductions. A useful addition has been made to the series by a separate volume reproducing *An Itinerary of the English Cathedrals for the use of Travellers*, compiled by James G. Gilchrist,

¹ *Notes on Pottery Clays*. By James Fairie, F.G.S. London: Scott, Greenwood and Co., 1901.

² "Bell's Cathedral Series." *English Cathedrals: an Itinerary and Description*, by J. G. Gilchrist, with an Introduction by the Rev. J. Perkins, F.R.A.S.; *Bristol*, by H. J. L. J. Massé; *Ely*, by Rev. W. D. Sweeting; *Ripon*, by Cecil Hallett, B.A.; *St. David's*, by Philip Robson, A.R.I.B.A.; *Bath Abbey, Malpasbury Abbey, and Bradford-on-Avon Church*, by Rev. T. Perkins. London: George Bell & Sons, 1901.

A.M. (*artium magister*), M.D., University of Iowa, U.S.A. It is known that Americans are as avid of a land with cathedrals as Ruskin was averse to a country without castles. This handbook very conveniently takes the tourist at Liverpool, where Americans often land, and conducts him by a complete circuit through thirty cathedral towns. The Rev. T. Perkins has added, in an Introduction, a very brief but clear summary of the historical architecture of these cathedral churches; at the head of each chapter a brief synopsis of the ecclesiastical character and architectural features of each cathedral church; and, at the end, the names of other buildings in the neighbourhood which the tourist, with time at his disposal, will find worth a visit. Of the volumes devoted to particular cathedrals, that of *Bristol* is peculiarly interesting in its history of the church and monastery of Augustine canons, which became the cathedral church of the See founded at the Reformation. *Ely* has its wonderful exterior and interior details, with examples of every epoch of English architecture. *Ripon* is one of the most venerable of English churches. *St. David's*, which is otherwise one of the most perfect volumes of the series, is wanting in the historic details of the See itself, perhaps because an architect takes little interest in the ecclesiastical part. The volume on *Bath*, *Malmesbury*, and *Bradford-on-Avon* belongs to a series of Abbey and other Churches uniform with the Cathedral Series, and following the same excellent plan. A detail worth noting is that the price of each book is now 1s. 6d., instead of the original shilling.

THE
WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CLVI. No. 6.— DECEMBER 1901.

THE PARADOX OF LIBERAL
IMPERIALISM

THE Liberal party can scarcely look back upon the past five years with any degree of satisfaction. The foreign policy of England during that time has been conducted on principles which may be praiseworthy and enlightened, but which are certainly not Liberal. Yet some of the strongest supporters of that policy and of its disastrous results have been men who sit on the Front Opposition Bench. As for the record of the present Government in home affairs, perhaps the less said about it the better. The time, indeed, has not been propitious for what our leading newspaper elegantly calls "fiddling" with social reform. And we who think that this kind of "fiddling" is all-important to the people of this country and this Empire, are compelled sorrowfully to admit that neither at the present moment, nor for years to come, is there the slightest chance of anything substantial being done to ameliorate social conditions or to rectify social abuses. Monopolists will continue to grind the faces of the poor; taxation will continue to be imposed on those least able to bear it; the governing classes (for there are still "governing classes") will continue to govern in their own interests and those of their friends, fortified by an abundance of that kind of patriotism which is so sustaining because other people pay for it. And why? There is only one reason: South Africa, that land which to Mr. Froude seemed, twenty years ago, to be "lying under a curse," lies to-day under the blackest curse in its history, and has succeeded in dragging England with it under the same dark shadow. Yes; it is useless to deny that the war has changed the face of politics in England for years to come; it has

shattered, for the time being, the once great Liberal party; and one begins to doubt whether we shall ever know that party again as we once knew it, united, coherent, possessed by common ideals, penetrated by common enthusiasms.

Let it at once be said that South Africa was only the proximate, and not the ultimate, cause of the split in the Liberal party. The ultimate cause was, of course, the conflict of opinion among Liberals on what has come to be known as "Imperialism." We are all tired of the word "Imperialism," and of so-called definitions of the word, which define nothing. Suffice it to say that there are Liberals who have accepted this new gospel—it only dates from D'Israeli's day—and who have labelled themselves, or have been labelled, Liberal Imperialists; and there are Liberals who have frankly rejected it, and who have been styled "Little Englanders," though, for a reason to be shown presently, we shall here call them simply "Non-Imperialists." Now let us mark time for a moment. Lord Rosebery has recently told us that the issue on which these two parties are divided is the issue as between an "insular" view of national affairs and a broad, comprehensive, and truly Imperial view. It is curious that a man of Lord Rosebery's experience and judgment should make such a profound mistake. On that issue there is no division in the Liberal party. There is not, one imagines, a single Liberal of any importance who is, strictly speaking, a "Little Englander"—i.e., one, briefly, who holds that England would be better, politically and economically, without its colonies and dependencies over sea. There are Non-Imperialists in the party, but there are no "Little Englanders." We who are Non-Imperialists have as fervent a faith in Greater Britain and in the destiny of the Anglo-Saxon race as the most "patriotic" Jingo of them all; and we are Non-Imperialists simply because we have seen more and more clearly of recent years that what is called Imperialism is essentially anti-Liberal. Perhaps we do not talk quite so much about the greatness and the glory of the British Empire as our Imperialist friends; but, like Mr. Watts-Dunton's gipsy and the sunset, while they "enjoy talking about it" we "enjoy letting it soak in." We commend that distinction between the two parties to Lord Rosebery as being more true to the facts than the one he has given us. However, to come back to our argument, the most interesting political question of the immediate future is, which school of thought is to win the allegiance of the Liberal party as a whole, Imperialist or Non-Imperialist? The Tory Press tells us, in its assertive way, that Imperialism is bound in the nature of things to win; that the Imperialist leaders are to rally round them "all that is best and soundest" in English Radicalism; and that the result is to be a strong and united "National Liberal party," which even the *Times* will be able to regard with a certain amount of satisfaction. All

this may be true, but we who are Non-Imperialists can hardly be expected to believe it. On the contrary, we believe that the "main stream of Liberalism" does flow in the direction indicated by Mr. Morley and Mr. Courtney, rather than in that indicated by Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Henry Fowler. We believe, indeed, that a healthy Liberalism is incompatible with Imperialism, and that what is called Liberal Imperialism is, to put the matter briefly, a complete contradiction in terms.

What, then, is our charge against the so-called Liberal Imperialists? Simply this: that so long as they remain in the region of the abstract their sentiments are so innocuous that the most pious Liberal can, as a rule, subscribe to them with an unruffled conscience, but when they descend to the concrete, they not only fail to abide by these enlightened sentiments, but they are found to be active supporters of lines of policy and conduct which can be demonstrably shown to be inconsistent with acknowledged Liberal principles. After all, vague generalities are of almost no value. They must be brought to the test of the concrete case. And so we propose to submit the opinions of Liberal Imperialists to this test and to see how they emerge from it.

South Africa is of course, our concrete case. How do Liberal Imperialists stand with regard to it? Let us see. We suppose Lord Rosebery's phrase—"A free, tolerant, and unaggressive Empire," sums up not only what Imperialists would wish the British Empire to be, but what they actually believe it to be at the present moment. It is indeed a beautiful phrase, "free, tolerant, unaggressive." Unfortunately this phrase can be, and in point of fact is, used by the most eccentric chauvinists quite innocently and conscientiously. These kind of people revel in beautiful phrases, and are (*à la* D'Israeli) proverbially indifferent as to whether they correspond to, or have any relation with, facts or not. In the matter of South Africa, then, have we really been "free, tolerant, unaggressive"? The adjective "free" may be dismissed from the discussion as being irrelevant, though it may be as well to remark that the suspension of the constitution in Cape Colony, one of the most significant results of our South African policy, suggests that the word should be taken with saving qualifications. But "tolerant and unaggressive"! Now, surely, there is some mistake here. Mr. Chamberlain is an extremely clever and successful man; he has certain qualities which many of our enthusiastic Radical friends who invariably lose their temper when they speak of him would do well to cultivate: but he is perhaps the last person in this world whom any of us would describe as "unaggressive" or "tolerant." And Mr. Chamberlain stands for the last five years of our policy in South Africa. If there is any merit attaching to the results of that policy, he has it; if there is any merit attaching to that policy—

a country drenched in blood and war, a great glory to be snatching from our grasp"—it is his. But let us not wilfully deceive ourselves. The whole course of the Chamberlain-Kruger negotiations was marked by a tone and temper on the part of the Colonial Secretary which was aggressive, intolerant and irritating in the extreme. Mr. Kruger had his faults, too; but that is beside our present point. There never were a series of despatches penned by an English minister less informed by the spirit of tolerance than those sent by Mr. Chamberlain to President Kruger during 1896-99. They were not even decently polite. And what did this signify? It surely signified that there was constantly present in Mr. Chamberlain's mind the impertinent idea that it was not necessary to be either tolerant or polite when dealing with a small and weak power. "Unaggressive," says Lord Rosebery. But Mr. Chamberlain constantly increased his demands on President Kruger, notwithstanding the fact that these demands, many of them, were such as we should not have dared to make on a great Power, and that, to make the thing respectable, Mr. Chamberlain had to put forward the allegation that the Transvaal was a vassal State, an allegation which, as Sir Edward Clarke said, was "a denial of fact and a breach of national faith." "Tolerant"—tolerance denotes a certain forbearance towards, nay, a certain sympathy with, ideals which are opposed to one's own. We have a certain ideal of government, the French have another, the Russians another, the Boers another; yet how often have we heard supporters of Mr. Chamberlain and of this war argue that because the Boers had, for example, an "oligarchical" government, therefore it was our duty to show them our own supposed better way? It is a truism, of course, that a good government is one that the people of the country consider to be good; yet we have constantly the sad spectacle—as in South Africa—of Englishmen going round the world, settling here and there, and raising an indignant howl if they do not find, so to say, Trial by Jury, a House of Lords, and an Established Church in full swing in the country of their adoption. Superior virtue is an admirable thing: but let us have some of Lord Rosebery's "tolerance" for those unfortunate creatures who are not in the same state of grace as we. And if it be argued, as it legitimately may be argued, that the presence of a large number of subjects of Great Britain in the Transvaal, men who were allowed by the Transvaal Government to enter the country and settle there for the purposes of trade and commerce—gave us an additional right to see that they were properly treated by the Government of that country, let us never forget that we had practically forfeited that right by the criminal conduct of many of these citizens, in attempting, with the aid and approval of the Prime Minister of the Queen in Cape Colony, to capture the Transvaal by force of arms. The Prime Minister of Cape Colony directed an

invasion of the territories of the South African Republic, the anticipated aim of "dishonourable conduct" in the House of Commons; we pushed up the enquiry into the circumstances of that invasion at the critical moment for a reason still unknown to the public: did not this give President Kruger's Government an additional claim on our tolerance and forbearance? Mr. Chamberlain admitted that it did; but his despatches never breathed that sweet reasonableness which the occasion seemed to demand. And so, looking at the whole matter as dispassionately as possible, we are compelled to the conclusion that, in our dealings with the late South African Republic, that unaggressive and tolerant spirit was absent which would have informed them if we had been negotiating with a great Power, and which we all think so admirable in any circumstances.

But there is behind this a more serious question. If one principle more than another has characterised Liberal foreign policy in the past it has been that of the supremacy of moral considerations over considerations that are material or political. This marks it off sharply from traditional Tory foreign policy. The honest Tory recognises no right but that of might, no consideration except one: the (supposed) material interests of his country. As Lord Salisbury has recently pointed out, the one question to be asked concerning any course of action in foreign affairs is, "Is it likely to further British interests?"; the question "Is it right?" being, doubtless, only for persons of the type of the nursemaid who occasionally "crosses the mind" of the Prime Minister. Well, that is the Bismarckian theory, and there is a good deal to be said for it, but it is not Liberalism. We do not say that the principle of the supremacy of right has always been acted upon by Liberal statesmen in their foreign relations; but it is the ideal of Liberalism. And here is the important point—out of this ideal has been born the regard which Liberals have always had for small nationalities. They have always looked with sympathy on the efforts of a small people rightly "struggling to be free," on the ground that a great nation has no moral right to extinguish the life of a little one in order to advance her own material interests, any more than a strong individual has the right to take the life of a weak one for the same purpose. This, then, is the Liberal tradition: a scrupulous regard for the rights of small peoples, and a sympathy with their aspirations for distinct national life. We have said above that Imperialists "are found to be active supporters of lines of policy and conduct which can be demonstrably shown to be inconsistent with acknowledged Liberal principles." Is it necessary to point out that the policy of the Government in regard to the late South African Republic has been wholly inconsistent with this particular Liberal principle? In the conduct of the negotiations before the war broke out, in our contemptuous refusal to treat with the Boers except on terms of "un-

conditional surrender," in our "no shred of independence" attitude, culminating in the annexation and attempted subjugation of the two Republics by force of arms: in all these things we have been—to put it on this basis for the sake of our argument—anti-Liberal. The case of the Orange Free State is particularly bad, for we had no quarrel with them, and to "annex" the country simply because it declared war on us is defensible by no principle either of law or morality. Liberal Imperialists, indeed, admit that we have departed from Liberal tradition. How do they excuse the departure? Mr. E. T. Cook, perhaps the most brilliant member of the school, says: "The idea of nationality as an absolute end can no longer compel the devotion of Liberalism." In the name of Gladstone, why? What single circumstance differentiates the case of the South African Republics from that, say, of Poland, where the "idea of nationality," "compelled the devotion of Liberals"! (We overlook the phrase "absolute end" as meaningless and irrelevant; there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as an "absolute end.") The answer is, of course, none: and we think it only fair to make the obvious remark that it is a very cheap kind of Liberalism which professes noble and generous sentiments when the interests of oneself and one's country are not immediately concerned, and which goes back on those sentiments when they are. And why can the idea of nationality no longer "compel the devotion of Liberalism"? Apparently because some of our younger men have taken to reading Darwin, and have discovered, about the same time as the bishops, that there is such a law in nature as the "survival of the fittest." We of course, the English stock, are the fittest: obviously therefore the South African Dutch are less fit: therefore—it is a law of nature—they must disappear. All this is very grotesque and puerile, and it is difficult to treat it with proper seriousness. Neolithic man, it is true, tomahawked his weaker brother when the fancy seized him, or when he wished anything particularly choice belonging to the weaker brother, and which the latter was unwilling to give up. But civilisation, *pede claudo*, came along: men began to see that weaker brethren had their place too in the cosmos, albeit they could not hunt game in the forests or effectively wield the implements of warfare; and so gradually mankind began to coalesce into communities for mutual help and protection. Now, an exactly similar process has been going on as between nations during the past few hundred years. They too had their "tomahawking" era. A Roman General had no squeamish regard for the rights of a smaller people: he made the place where they dwelt a solitude and passed on. But gradually the rights of small nations to a separate national existence came to be recognised by the great ones; partly (some would say, wholly) on the ground of convenience, partly, as Liberals believe, as a result of humanitarian theories of "natural rights." At this point enter modern Imperialists, Liberal and Tory, with the usual alarms and

excursions, proclaiming aloud the downfall of small nationalities on account of a certain unfortunate law of nature called the "survival of the fittest"! Of course it will not do. This kind of talk is amusing enough; but when the Imperialist affects the superior air of a man who is in advance of his fellows in the matter of wisdom and light, it is surely time to tell him plainly how ignorant he is. Far from being a pioneer or a light-bringer, he is a reactionary of the worst type. He would throw us back to what we have called the "tomahawking" era: he would have us fling away the hard won results of the experience of countless generations. Now let us make an admission to the pseudo-scientific Imperialist, and at the same time, tell him where he is wrong. All of us who have hopes and aspirations for the world's future look forward, as Imperialists do, to a time when—if the phrase be permitted—there shall only be one nationality, the human nationality: when men shall break down the artificial barriers of race, and shall acknowledge that the brotherhood of man is a reality and not a dream: when men shall cease to fight with one another, and shall war, if at all, with the forces of nature alone. We look forward to this; but it will not come, as the Imperialists preach, by one people trampling over all the other peoples and subduing them by the power of the sword. It will only come with the growth of amity between nation and nation, with the permeation of the lower nation with the ideals of the higher, with the gradual extinction of inter-racial prejudice, through the prevalence of what Matthew Arnold's bishop would call "right reason and the will of God." We all of us hope for a millennium of this kind: we do not work towards it by defying the principle of nationality: we retard it the rather. If Imperialists, therefore, continue to talk glibly of that principle as being effete and outworn they are welcome to their delusion, as they are welcome to their Disraelian title; but they have no part or lot in the inheritance of Liberalism.

The attitude of Liberal Imperialists, again, towards the ever-growing danger of militarism is highly significant. No phenomenon of recent years has been more apparent and more disquieting than the rise of what we may call "the cult of the soldier." Tliackeray's lines in the noble *Ballad of the Drum* are peculiarly appropriate to-day:

"... The red-coat bully in his boots
That hides the march of men from us.
He puts him there in foremost rank;
You wonder at his cap of hair;
You hear his sabre's cursed clank;
His spurs are jingling everywhere."

The spurs of "the man in khaki" are indeed "jingling everywhere." In the streets, in the clubs, in the Senate House, in places of popular amusement; you meet him wherever you go. Well, he is good fellow, individually, the "man in khaki," but the cult is

tiresome. When every half-pay colonel has a plan for the re-organisation of the forces in his pocket; when the Secretary of State for War thrusts a scheme of Army Reform on the country which nobody wants, and supports it on the plea that we have generals and must give them work; when the Chancellor of the Exchequer cries out for more money for the army again and again; when popular novelists spend their leisure time in organising rifle clubs, with the ultimate intention, alas! of turning them into "copy"; and popular preachers make painful efforts to prove that "there are worse things than war"; then, naturally, one begins to get fatigued. But the thing has a sinister side to it as well as a comical. The advocates of conscription are becoming bolder and bolder, and, taking advantage of the public panic, are openly preaching their gospel in the House of Commons. The Secretary of State for War hints that if his scheme break down there is nothing for it but compulsory service. How do the Liberal Imperialists regard this prospect? Speaking in January of last year, Lord Rosebery said: "I do not see that it is so immeasurably remote as the noble Marquis considers, that some form of compulsory service should have to be introduced to meet the growing exigencies of the Empire; and I am quite sure that neither from that nor from any other sacrifice will the nation recoil to preserve the predominance of this Empire." Now, it is ill guiding at a man of genius, particularly when that man happens to be a person for whom one entertains a profound admiration and esteem; but it is better to say at once that, if this be Lord Rosebery's view, it is not a Liberal view, nor is it one which would be acceptable to the Liberalism of this country. We do not propose to go into the question of conscription here, or to set out again the old arguments for and against which we have heard so often. But Lord Rosebery speaks of the "exigencies of Empire." Obviously this does not apply to Great Britain and Ireland, or to Canada, or to Australia, or even to India; the "exigencies of Empire" are entirely the "exigencies" of the Empire in South Africa. And so we come back to our concrete case again. We are annexing huge territories which, under the most favourable circumstances, we shall find difficult to hold and govern; therefore we must raise a huge army to help us do the work; therefore we must introduce compulsory service in order to obtain the men for the army. That, in naked terms, is what Lord Rosebery really means by the "growing exigencies of Empire." But is there any alternative? asks the practical man. Yes, there is an alternative; it is to change our policy. It is a truism, of course, to say that armaments and expenditure depend upon policy; but it is the kind of truism which needs to be repeated over and over again, because it is so basal and important, and because people will not listen to a gospel which is so simple and unheroic. Change your policy; revert to principles of equity and justice; cease insulting

next neighbours by whose side you have to live, refuse them annexing territories which can only be a source of weakness and loss to the Empire as a whole. This, and not the piling up of armaments, is the true method of meeting the growing exigencies of Empire. Again, Lord Rosebery used the phrase, the "predominance of this Empire." The word "predominance" is hardly gracious; it connotes the inferiority of other empires: but in so far as it describes the present position of the British Empire, we are willing to let it stand. But are we, on the plea of "predominance," to seize every strip of territory which we think would be of advantage to us? And how far are the people of this country to sacrifice themselves to preserve this so-called "predominance"? The former question is apparently answered by our present Ministers in the affirmative. To give a "striking proof," for example, of our predominant influence in South Africa, we must conquer the Boer Republics. Very well, but how many sacrifices are we in this country to make in order to support this "predominance"? It seems poor consolation to a British working man or a British shopkeeper, who has to work two or three hours a day longer in order to pay the heavy taxes due to this "predominance" policy, who finds the luxuries of life quite beyond his reach and the necessities of life becoming dearer and dearer as time goes on, it seems poor consolation to such a one to be told "My dear sir, you must not grumble; we have now so many thousand square miles more within the Empire to-day than we had last year, the flag waves to-day where it waved not a year ago. It is true that you and your children and your children's children will have the pleasure of paying heavily for this extension of territory, but then think of the glory of it! Think of the positions it offers to the younger sons of your natural leaders, the aristocracy of England!" And now the unfortunate British worker is to be called to further sacrifices, he is to come under the most hateful and despicable of all tyrannies, the tyranny of the military man. The tragedy of it! Here we have arrived at a time when all our energies should be bent on education in its best and broadest sense; when the proper equipment of the British worker in all spheres should be engaging our most strenuous attention, our most watchful care, in order to cope with the fierce competition about to assail us; and what do we find? A Ministry determined on crippling education in order to please a half-educated priestly caste; money being poured out like water in order to seize a country which it will hardly pay us to hold on any terms; and, behind, the shadow of compulsory military service. The thing itself is disheartening. It is more disheartening still to find Liberals giving their support to it. Liberalism, it must never be forgotten, is not a creed, but a character, an attitude of mind. It may vary from time to time in the application of principles, but the principles themselves remain. And the tone and temper of mind which regards

compulsory military service as a contingency to be looked forward to with equanimity and even with satisfaction, is a tone and temper alien to all that is best and most praiseworthy in "British Liberalism."

We end as we began. Lord Rosebery is profoundly mistaken when he thinks that a considerable body of Liberals take an "insular" view of political affairs. The issue as between "insularity" and "comprehensiveness" of view is not the issue on which Imperialists are divided from non-Imperialists. There are few "Little Englanders" within the Liberal party as that term is understood by the Tory press. We who repudiate the term Imperialism agree with Imperialists in being legitimately proud of the greatness and beneficence of the British Empire; we believe in the colonies, and we believe in the Anglo-Saxon race. We agree with Imperialists also in aiming at a spirit of tolerance and goodwill in the conduct of our dealings with other nations. But this is a pious generality. We can only discover its value by bringing it to the test of a concrete case, and South Africa supplies us with such a case. We think that in regard to South Africa we have egregiously failed to display that unaggressive and tolerant spirit which all of us, Imperialists and non-Imperialists alike, believe to be desirable. Liberal Imperialists, on the contrary, think that Mr. Chamberlain's policy has been informed by that spirit, and accordingly support it. That is our first point of difference. Our next is more radical. Unionist Imperialism is, after all, founded on the root principle that, in all questions concerning the growth and extension of the Empire, there is no such thing as a "moral consideration." If an extension of territory, if the annexation of a Republic, is likely to advance the material interests of the Empire, that is the last word on the subject. Extend the territory, annex the Republic. Whether the action is "right" or "wrong" is quite irrelevant. Liberal Imperialists apparently adopt this view, wholly or partially, and excuse their new creed on pseudo-scientific or other grounds. Here non-Imperialists differ with them, and differ *totò uolo*, hopelessly, irreconcilably. We who believe in the Fox-Canning-Gladstone tradition never can and never will accept the "unmoral" theory of the conduct of national affairs. Finally, it is well to remember (how many problems would the timely remembrance solve!) the almost complete analogy between the nation and the individual; and we can never believe that the vices which make an individual most odious and detestable to those who are unhappy enough to have relations with him—arrogance, rapacity, intolerance, become virtues of the highest order when they happen to be the characteristics of a nation. Yet this, apparently, is the gospel of modern Imperialism.

S. P. KERR.

HELP TO RUINED FARMERS IN SOUTH AFRICA.

OF the many difficult questions which will have to be dealt with on the restoration of peace in South Africa, one of the most difficult and pressing will be the measures to be taken to re-start the farming industry and to supply the farmers with fixed capital to take the place of that which has been destroyed in the war. Not only farm-houses and buildings, but fences, implements, grain, and in many cases dams, have been destroyed over the length and breadth of the land: stock has been carried away or consumed. It is probably no exaggeration to say that the majority of farmers in both Colonies are ruined. They have no reserve of capital; on the contrary, their properties are in many cases mortgaged, and on the resumption of business they will be met with demands for the payment of interest and principal, which they will be in no position to meet. It is clear that the Government will have to come to their assistance, which to be effective must follow promptly on the submission or capture of those still in the field. Now is the time to give this vital question the careful consideration it needs, and to decide on the most economical and equitable way of repairing the public calamities.

An interesting parallel may be drawn from the descriptions of Silesia and the neighbouring Provinces after the Seven Years' War. Chancellor of the Exchequer von Struensee's words, speaking of Silesia, might be applied with scarcely any alteration to South Africa: "After the peace of 1763," he writes, "the conditions of credit for the Eastern landlords, notably in Silesia, were sore perplexed. In regions where the army had long been quartered estates were laid waste, farm buildings burnt, cattle driven away or starved, fields left untilled for years, and agricultural implements were in wretched ruin. The price of real estate fell to two-thirds, or even one-third of its normal value, and many whose lands bore debts to this amount became insolvent. Numerous failures and sequestrations resulted, which still further depreciated property" (quoted in *A History of Banking for all Countries*). Or in Frederick the Great's own words: "To form an idea of the general subversion, and how great were the desolation and discouragement, you must represent to yourself countries entirely ravaged, the very traces of the old habitations hardly discoverable. Towns, some ruined from top to

bottoms, others half destroyed by fire, 18,000 houses of which the very vestiges were gone. . . . Such, when the war ended, was the fatal spectacle over these provinces, which had once been so flourishing; however pathetic the description may be, it will never approach the touching and sorrowful impression which the sight of it produced."

Carlyle describes briefly. "The instantaneous practical alacrity with which Frederick set about repairing that immense miscellany of ruin." How "he found that it would never do to trust to the mere aid of time in such circumstances. At the end of the Thirty Years' War, Time, owing to absolute want of money, had been the one recipe of the Great Elector in a similar case, and Time was then found to mean about a hundred years. Frederick found that he must at once step in with active remedies, and on all hands strive to make the impossible possible. Luckily, he had in readiness as usual the funds for an eighth campaign, had such been needed. Out of this money he proceeded to rebuild towns and villages. From the corn stores were taken the supplies for the food of the people and sowing of the ground. The horses intended for the artillery, baggage, and commissariat, 60,000 horses, we have heard, were distributed among those who had none, to be employed in tillage of the land. Silesia was discharged from all taxes for six months. Pommern and Neumark for two years" (Carlyle, *Frederick the Great*, Book xxi. chapter ii.) But Frederick, "while by repeated gifts (*largesse*) he restored courage to the poor husbandmen who began to despair of their lot," also took care that his people should help themselves as far as they could. The Silesian Land Bank, which was established in 1769 by his orders, is well known as the earliest application of the principle of co-operation to matters of credit, and this Bank and the other German *Landschaften* created later, with some improvements on the original Society, are generally considered the parents of all Land Banks since established in Europe. It is from this point of view that the South African situation will be approached in this article, for while opinions may differ as to the limits in which assistance in the form of "gifts" may rightly be given to those who have been fighting against us, there can be no objection to such help when it takes the form of providing the ruined farmers with cheap and easy credit, whether through the agency of Government or in any other way; to which end a summary of the leading features of the German *Landschaften* and of the various other systems of Land Mortgage Banks in use on the Continent may be of some value.

The German *Landschaft* or Provincial Land Bank in its fully developed form is an association of proprietors (originally noble) for the purpose of borrowing on the security of the lands of all the members who are jointly and severally liable to the extent of the value of their lands for all the debts of the Bank. There are

differences of detail in the different Banks of which no account will be taken here, but broadly the leading features are as follows:

Loans are granted to members on first mortgage up to one-half, or, more rarely, two-thirds of the value of the property, and are repaid by annuities composed of (a) interest from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; (b) $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the principal, and (c) a contribution towards the expenses of management, the whole forming an annuity generally below 5 per cent. of the loan, which is thus paid off in fifty years or upwards. There is no share capital or dividends, any profits going to the Reserve Fund or to reducing the cost of loans. Funds are raised by the issue of Land Mortgage Debentures secured on the mass of the mortgages held by the Bank, and issued in exact correspondence with them, repayable at par as the mortgages are redeemed. The debentures have found a ready market at from $3\frac{1}{2}$ to $4\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and have proved absolutely safe. Neither they nor the mortgages are repayable on demand, but the latter may be called in if the borrower allows his property to deteriorate so as to impair the security or falls into arrears in the payment of the annuities, and the borrower has the right of repaying his debt at any time. The management is in the hands of the members, under the supervision of a State Commissioner, by whom the principal officers of the Bank have to be approved. Every member is bound under the penalty of a fine to undertake any duty imposed on him by the directors. In this way the important local work of valuation and supervision of the estates mortgaged to the Bank so as to guard against the deterioration of the security is done cheaply and efficiently. Most of the *Landschaften* received a Government subvention at starting, and enjoy privileges as to the recovery of debts.

The *Landschaften* then and the similar institution in Hungary, the *Bodencreditinstitut*, are societies of borrowers, who unite their mutual and unlimited liability, with the object of obtaining loans on the most favourable terms. They are able to do this owing to the guarantees given and the precautions taken, which supply the lender with the necessary security. They are safe, because there is no inducement to undertake risky business, and the working expenses are reduced to a minimum, owing to the obligation on members to do the work of the Bank for a small remuneration, while their own interest ensures its being efficiently done.

The next class of Land Banks which are administered in the interest of borrowers and not for profit, are those created and managed by the State. They vary from Banks wholly financed and managed by the State to those where the State merely holds the largest number of shares and has a preponderating influence. They are generally found only in small States or Provinces, such as Hanover, Hesse-Nassau, and the Swiss Cantons. The Land Mortgage Bank of Berne, a State Institution, and the most

important of its kind in Switzerland, has been very successful; its chief source of funds is a foundation capital of £280,000 provided by the State, which is distributed in long-term mortgage loans repayable by annuities. The special feature of this Bank is that applications for loans have to come through the Council of the Commune where the applicant resides. The Council certifies that the applicant's statements as to the property, the valuation, &c., are correct, and the Commune are responsible for any loss arising from their fraud or neglect, or from any deterioration of the property, which they have omitted to report. Thus the real work and the real responsibility rest with the Communal Councils, who are unpaid and have every inducement to be careful and accurate in their valuations and supervision. By this means working expenses are kept low and the risk of loss much reduced. Some device of this sort seems necessary in every State Institution for making loans to farmers. It is essential that the lending Institution should be in close proximity to the borrower if credit is to be cheap and safe. No valuation of an expert or inspection of an official can be as cheap or as efficient as that of the borrower's neighbours, when, as in the German *Landschaften* and in the Communal Councils used by the Bernese Bank, they are responsible in their own pockets for any error or neglect. It is considered that the Bernese Mortgage Bank has rendered immense services by enabling the farmer by the system of amortisation to gradually free himself from debt, and also by the effect which the Bank has had in reducing the rate of interest on mortgage loans. "The Bernese Bank has successively fixed its rate of interest at $4\frac{3}{4}$, $4\frac{1}{2}$, $4\frac{1}{4}$ and finally 4 per cent. and the other real credit Banks have been obliged to follow suit" (*Report of Her Majesty's Representatives on Institutions for Making Advance on Real Property*, 1891).

The last class of Land Mortgage Banks with which we have to deal are associations of lenders whose object is not cheap loans, but the highest dividends consistent with safety. These Banks generally combine some ordinary banking business—*e.g.*, the receiving of deposits—with that of making advances on real property. The best known of these Capitalist Societies is the *Credit Foncier* of France, which is a Joint Stock Company, making loans on mortgage, either for a long term repayable by annuities within from ten to seventy-five years, or for a short term by annuities or in lump. Funds are raised by the issue of debentures secured on the mortgages held by the Bank and on its share capital. Rate of interest is limited to 60 above the rate paid on the debentures issued by the Bank. The *Credit Foncier* is under Government supervision, received at starting a Government subvention, and enjoys various fiscal and legal privileges for the recovery of its debts, having had a monopoly of these privileges for the twenty-five years after its foundation. It has done an immense business, chiefly in advances on urban properties.

From this very brief sketch, for which the writer has largely drawn on Mr. F. A. Nicholson's comprehensive *Report on the Possibility of introducing Land and Agricultural Banks into the Madras Presidency* (1895), the respective advantages and disadvantages of the three main classes of institutions for dispensing credit to farmers on the security of their lands—viz.: (1) Societies of borrowers (Mutual Credit Associations), (2) State institutions, and (3) Joint Stock Companies—may perhaps be gathered. They are alike in their methods of raising funds by debentures, and in the system of loans granted for very long terms and repayable by fixed annuities of which the percentage paid on account of principal is so small as to be scarcely perceptible. The essential difference between them is that in the Mutual Associations and the State Banks the interests of the borrowers and the Bank are identical, while in the Joint Stock Company they are opposed. In the Mutual Associations, too, not only is the guarantee provided by the members, but the work is largely done by them, and more cheaply and efficiently than it could be by any other means. Experience seems to show that a large Central Bank, whether State or Joint Stock, is not successful in making cheap loans to farmers, the expenses of agency and supervision and the risk of loss being too great. Some link is required between the Central Institution situated in the Capital and the farmer in the remote country district, which may be supplied by the State lending to local Mutual Associations or making use of the Communal organisation, as in Switzerland and Russia.

Circumstances and the experience of other countries certainly point to some kind of Land Mortgage Bank as the best means to enable the farmers in the new Colonies to tide over the present crisis. The Bank would take over on the most favourable terms obtainable the present mortgages on the farms, and make further advances up to the maximum amount permitted by the rules, such mortgage debts and advances to be repaid by fixed annuities extending over a long period. In this way the farmers will have an opportunity of gradually rebuilding their prosperity, while the security of the Bank and therefore of the Debenture holders would be annually improving with the gradual restoration of the farms to what they were before the war, and with the increase of the general prosperity of the country. Whatever system of Bank be adopted, and it is not intended here to dogmatise on the subject, to decide which would require a much longer experience of South Africa than the writer possesses, it will have to be initiated and receive financial support as well as close supervision from the Government. For in the present condition of the country private enterprise will not be powerful enough to start such an undertaking without considerable Government aid, and without Government control the interests of the borrowers will not be sufficiently considered. This is recognised in the suggestions made by Major

Armstrong, Assistant Financial Adviser to the Minister of Finance (Report of the Land Settlement Commission, p. 272), for the establishment of a Land Mortgage Bank. He advocates the creation of a Joint Stock Company of which one-third of the capital is to be found by the shareholders and two-thirds by the issue of 3 per cent Debentures guaranteed by the Government. The rate of interest on loans is to be fixed at 6 per cent., and the dividends on the ordinary shares he estimates at between 5½ and 6½ per cent. But if the Government is to be pledged to such an extent as this, and to exercise such close supervision as would be necessary in the interests of the country, it is a question whether it should not go further and either by itself, or better if it were possible, by creating and financing local associations of farmers, establish a system of credit wholly in the interests of the borrowers. Major Armstrong implies that such a company as he suggests would take a great weight off the shoulders of the Government. The question is whether in the circumstances of the country the Government can divest itself of this responsibility, whether a merely commercial Company would be capable of such enlightened self-interest as to conduct its business so as to secure the support of all parties. For although any Credit Undertaking such as has been described must be conducted on business principles, if it is to succeed, considerations of a wider nature must not altogether be left out of account. It is also doubtful whether a Joint Stock Company operating over the whole country could be run as cheaply as Major Armstrong seems to think, even if working through a Bank which already has local branches. On the whole, with the restrictions and supervision which would be necessary, a Joint Stock Land Bank, even with a Government guarantee, does not seem an undertaking likely to be very tempting to investors.

The situation has in this article been considered only with reference to existing owners of farms who would alone come within the sphere of operations of a Land Bank. But it must not be forgotten that there will be new settlers who will also require assistance from the Government, which Major Armstrong suggests might be given in a similar way. It is difficult to see how this could be worked, for it should be a rule of any bank to lend money only on the security of a farm and only up to 50 per cent or possibly 75 per cent. of its value, so that new settlers, unless possessed of sufficient capital to buy a farm, would not be eligible for loans from a Land Bank. Some other agency will have to deal with this very urgent question, which is of equal importance with that of enabling the original owners of farms to start life again, and it is probable that some experiments will have to be made and some loss incurred.

A PLEA FOR AN ANGLO-FRENCH ALLIANCE

UNDER the present conditions of public policy on the mainland of Europe there must of necessity be a ceaseless struggle to keep the balance of power in the interests of the general peace. Thus, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Italy and, perhaps we may add, Turkey, keep forming and re-forming into little groups of allies and opponents, ever changing and re-changing as the balance of power is itself inclined to shift from one group to another. No Continental power, therefore, can stand quite alone, pursue a peculiar policy of her own, or act independently of her neighbours, unless we except Russia, who might, if she chose, desert an European for a purely Asiatic policy, but who obviously prefers to remain, as Peter the Great taught her, the eastern outpost of Europe rather than the back-door of Asia. In strong contrast to this tied-and-bound condition of the Continental nations is that of the United Kingdom. The expressive phrase of 'splendid isolation' has not been bestowed in vain upon Great Britain, for her geographical conditions render her practically independent of the various political formations of the mainland, and yet, at the same time, whilst standing well outside European politics and intrigues, she has at least as much to offer in the way of alliance as any of the four leading Powers of the Continent – a fact which is perfectly well known and realised by them. Seeing, then, our peculiar good fortune both of position and circumstance, it is absolutely essential, if we desire to come to closer terms of friendship with any one power, that the overtures should come first from ourselves, and not from the particular State we wish to court, and consequently to detach from some already existing Continental alliance. No European State would dare to disturb by alliance with an outsider that delicate equilibrium held by the family of nations on the mainland, unless she were quite sure beforehand of advantages that would fully compensate for the inevitable disturbances and hostile formations that such a stroke of policy on her part would certainly entail. It must therefore be the first duty of Great Britain to prove to her would-be ally that a *rapprochement* with herself will be worth the breaking of old Continental ties and understandings.

Now if there is one European nation that in the opinion of the writer England should endeavour to conciliate and draw into close alliance it is France. Many and obvious are the arguments for an Anglo-French alliance both of Governments and of peoples. In the first place, it is from the near-lying French coasts that England can alone be well invaded (as, indeed, she often was in mediæval times and even later), and in modern history France has been the only European nation that has ever seriously threatened English liberty and independence. It is not, however, from fear of any possible French invasion (which most Englishmen regard as chimerical), but from strong mutual interests of peace and well-being, that a closer and better understanding with France is most desirable. We are such very near neighbours, London and Paris being less than eight hours distant by rail and boat. Both of us are colonising nations; indeed, France is the only Continental Power that now possesses a valuable colonial empire. Again, France, if she has been in past centuries our historic rival and enemy, has also been in modern times our active ally and comrade-in-arms in not a few instances—(we must not forget how English and French soldiers and sailors fought side by side in the Crimean War less than fifty years ago). Lastly—in the writer's opinion most important of all—England and France are both true democracies, representing full liberty of conscience and person as contrasted with the Cæsarism of Germany and Austria and the cast-iron autocracy of Russian imperialism. To these two lands of progress and freedom in the Old World there is a third, our own first cousin of America, who would undoubtedly welcome our new friendship with France, her old historic ally. In addition, of course, to these special points there are the usual arguments for promoting peace and concord that can be applied on behalf of any two civilised nations, only intensified in the case of France and England.

At present England seems inclined to gravitate towards a fixed alliance with Germany, the reason for which lies partly in the fact that our own reigning family, itself of pure German descent, is closely related not only to the Emperor William II., but also to many of the smaller Protestant potentates of the Empire. Now no one will object to any policy that will bring neutrality and friendship with it, but need this pro-German policy be pursued further than to gain these two points? Of necessity Germany can never hurt us. She has a watchful and unforgiving enemy on her Rhenish borders, longing for revenge and for the recovery of lost territory; she has a treacherous and overwhelming foe in Russia on her eastern frontiers. Alliance with England under such circumstances naturally means a great deal to Germany, but her reciprocation is of little real value to us. Already by the latest political agreement Germany has gained much from England both in Samoa and in China, but she

does not yet by any means consider her bill to us for her Emperor's "not her people's" moral support" during the troubled times of the winter of 1899 and the spring of 1900 to have been nearly met. She is still building on English support, moral or material, to carry out far-reaching and ambitious schemes in the future, notably in the matter of colonial expansion. Moreover, her Emperor, who, like Louis XIV., holds strongly the view of "*l'état, c'est moi*," has plainly hinted that he is only biding time and opportunity for a quarrel with the sovereign-power of the Americas that shall end in a war, not of tariffs, but of armies and fleets. The savour of the Monroe doctrine stinks in his imperial nostrils, and he looks forward to colonising some parts of the New World and founding a new Teutonic empire there. Shall we be expected, when the time comes, to take arms against our own kin across the Atlantic on behalf of Germany, or will William II be satisfied if England only remain neutral and look listlessly on? Is the break-up of the deep-rooted understanding between these two kindred peoples, the most progressive and enlightened in the world, to be the ultimate price we are to pay for a few frothy speeches and a visit (followed as they already have been by valuable concessions on our part) of the German Emperor? Have we not truly paid enough, and more than enough, for any sympathy—one can hardly call it *support*—we may have received in the past from this quarter? Again, does not this barren alliance of England with Germany account not a little for the continuance of the Franco-Russian agreement, which is just now exercising so severely the minds of English politicians? There can be but little in common between republican and democratic France and the semi-barbarous unwieldy empire ruled by a despotic Czar, so that it is fairly obvious that the Dual Alliance, so far as France is concerned, is one of pure necessity. She has been left out in the cold by the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria, and Italy, and thus, England holding aloof, she has been, by the inexorable law of the European balance of power, compelled either to stand alone (which she dare not), or else to seek this unnatural alliance with Russia.

Granting, now, the supreme desirability of an Anglo-French alliance, what are the chief obstacles that at this moment bar the way to such a good understanding as will bring a full sense of confidence to each nation? Alas! Anglo-French relations have been now for some years past strained, not diplomatically, but nationally, and prejudice and ignorance on both sides have not a little to do with this answer. Each nation has of late been trying to "score off" the other, each pointing out defects in her neighbour's internal affairs or magnifying small points of dispute, chiefly in distant colonies, with a view to irritate and annoy. In both countries, too to an extent that can neither be ignored nor excused, there have been many signs of racial hatred in all-too-frequent cases of personal insult

and abuse, and though such incidents are equally deplored by all good English and French citizens alike, yet the number of such incidents goes far to prove the depth of the animosity existing at present between the two peoples. Careful statecraft on both sides has fortunately so far kept the two countries from a collision in these troubled waters of distrust and dislike, but such men as Lord Salisbury and M. Delcassé cannot remain helmsmen for ever, and the time may be close at hand when we shall see irresponsible and impatient politicians in their places. Steps should be taken, then, and taken quickly, to invite a sound, lasting arrangement between the two peoples, so that neither may suffer from future official misunderstandings or follies. And such an invitation for an Anglo-French *entente cordiale*, to take the place of the present unsatisfactory relations, must come first from England for reasons already given, the only question being what form such an invitation to France is to assume.

Having made up our minds to inaugurate a policy of conciliation towards France, we must, in the first place, lay aside the widely spread belief that France is radically hostile to England, for she is not hostile, only at present hyper-sensitive and somewhat irritated. We should cease, therefore, to assert in our papers and in our conversation (as, alas! is almost universally done, even in quarters where one might expect reserve and discretion) that the French proved themselves our avowed enemies during the early part of the South African War; that they insulted our late Queen and our nation in their press; that they urged the other nations of Europe to combine and intervene in favour of the two Boer Republics; that they are still intriguing and scheming against British policy and interests in every place and by every method. All these charges are practically untrue. However strong at any time was the personal feeling of thousands of educated, and tens of thousands of uneducated, Frenchmen, the official attitude of France, as expressed by her President and her Minister for Foreign Affairs, was always scrupulously correct, a fact even our most violent Francophobists cannot deny. Both M. Loubet and M. Delcassé repeatedly informed the French nation that there was not the slightest desire or intention to intervene in the Anglo-Boer struggle; it was reserved chiefly for the Monarchist press (the organs of that traitorous party in France which Englishmen as a rule prefer) to cry out for European intervention, a political move that was quite as much due to a desire to upset the Waldeck-Rousseau Ministry and to embarrass the Republic as to any genuine hatred of *perfidie Albion*. Criticise, and seldom favourably, the French journals naturally did; but it is doubtful whether their comments were more caustic or personal than many that appeared in our own newspapers under that first fierce stress of anxiety and disappointment in England. The leading French organs were usually

and, though sympathising, as was only natural, with the smaller and weaker combatant, and were often fully alive to the extraordinary difficulties that had to be overcome by the British nation in this particular war. *Inter alia*, the writer remembers to have read in the *Figaro* a most appreciative article, full of admiration not only for the plucky efforts of the out-manceuvred British troops in Natal, but also for the calmness and unbroken confidence with which the British nation received the news of the serious reverses of that terrible winter of 1899. To this our national dignity and unshaken faith in ultimate success the writer in the *Figaro* paid the highest tribute, even venturing to describe the probable disastrous consequences in France of such blows as England had recently endured without wincing.

We must remember, too, how ignorant and mischievous was the attempt made to stir up still more fiercely the bad feeling on both sides of the Channel on account of the silly and indecent cartoons published in certain of the Parisian papers against Queen Victoria and the British generally. A sense of humour is unfortunately not a characteristic of our nation, and never was the absence of it more clearly shown than in the endeavour of Mr. Chamberlain and other politicians of his school to treat seriously the wild ravings and vulgar prints of such miserable rags as the *Rire* or the *Silhouette*, papers that are bought almost solely by the *flâneur* of the boulevards or the prurient-minded tourist in Paris. And yet, as a matter of fact, by far the worst caricatures and most violent and untruthful outpourings of venomous spite appeared in the German papers, and often in German papers of a very different calibre to that of the Parisian gutter-press, the worst being, as far the writer can remember, a special number, dealing with the South African War, of *Lüstige Blätter*, which had an enormous sale throughout Europe. Nor was this Teutonic vilification of our Sovereign and our nation confined to Berlin alone, for Munich, Vienna, Cologne, and Dresden were all equally to the fore with coarse anti-British diatribes and pictures in their comic papers. Most people will agree with the writer in considering it the obvious duty of every statesman worthy of the name to ignore completely such puerile attacks, but if notice is to be taken at all, why should not the worst and most persistent offender be selected for rebuke?—and in this case Germany, our present ally and the home of our reigning family, was *facile princeps* in this anti-English campaign of lies and scurrility.

Another cause of strained Anglo-French relations which we must not overlook is to be found in our curious and inconsistent dislike of the present French Republic, and in our prejudiced opinion of all its ways and means. This attitude on our part, making us repeatedly point out the failings of law and justice in France, has, of course, been answered by the inevitable rejoinders from our neighbour.

reflecting on our own imperfections. Cannot both nations make up their minds once for all to stop this petty and undignified controversy of tit for tat? For ourselves, why should we not in word and deed cordially support the Republic, seeing that France has deliberately chosen it for her form of government, and ignore the various adventurers and pretenders who from time to time plot against and embarrass it. How foolish we have been not to realise our duty in this respect before has recently been clearly and unpleasantly brought home to us in the case of the Duc d'Orléans, for years a favourite in English society and the possessor of a considerable band of political sympathisers in our islands. Let us all remember, and remember never to forget, the mean, treacherous, and disgraceful part this impudent and ungrateful opportunist took in the anti-English campaign on the Continent during the war.

Quitting now the question of Anglo-French jealousy and dislike, let us enumerate as shortly as possible the mutual advantages which are likely to be gained by a good understanding between the two nations. Taking the case of England, in the first place we shall find that France, being now able with her new ally's support to stand alone in Europe, will relax her cordiality towards Russia (as already suggested in this article), a result very grateful to most Englishmen, who, rightly or wrongly, firmly believe in Russian antipathy and intended aggression. Again, France being now friendly to England, our old ally, Italy, will in all probability desert the Triple Alliance in favour of that country to whom she is not a little bound by ties of race and also of past services in the cause of her independence. Thus any adverse scheme of the three Empires will be satisfactorily met by the new Triple Alliance of the West — England, France, and Italy. Thirdly, the burden of the situation in Egypt will be greatly lightened for us, France now leaving us a free hand in that quarter and ceasing to raise further difficulties in our administration of the country. Lastly—and this result will apply equally to both England and France—there will be an end (and for ever, let us hope) of all those unpleasant incidents and colonial disputes which have of late years caused such anxiety and required such delicate diplomacy between the two countries.

For France, from the newly acquired goodwill and reciprocation of England, should in her turn come generous treatment of many open questions. Let the everlasting and complicated dispute over the Newfoundland fisheries be settled finally, England meting out a full and satisfactory compensation to all French claims. Let us allow French policy a free hand in Morocco, providing only for the integrity of the Spanish possessions on the coast; in Tripoli, stipulating only for any existing rights possessed by Turkey or Italy; in further India, saving only the independence of the ancient kingdom of Siam. Let us give way on any small points of dispute in Western Africa,

in Madagascar, or in the islands of the Pacific, ever bearing in mind how often in the past France has played jackal to England's lion in the matter of colonial expansion. All this, of course, is but the barest outline of a mutual policy of give-and-take, to be pursued after an understanding between the two countries, an understanding that must inevitably bring many more results than those mentioned and become of world-wide importance and interest.

Having once secured this Anglo-French alliance, the next question will be how to keep it permanent and intact. This will be accomplished, in the first place, as the writer has already said, by a firm and unchanging support on the part of England of the French Republic, and by a stern disavowal of all disturbing opportunists and pretenders who scheme for its overthrow; and, in the second, by a fixed determination on both sides to forgive and forget the chief causes of dispute and antipathy in the past (of which the greatest and most remembered are the Jameson Raid trial in London, the scandal of the *affaire Dreyfus* in Paris and at Rennes, the story of the occupation and surrender of Tashoda), and to start afresh as comrades-in-arms and keepers of the peace and prosperity, not only of themselves, but of all Europe.

HERBERT M. VAUGHAN.

THE DEISTS AND THE DEISTIC MOVEMENT OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

THE names of the eighteenth-century Deists have come down to us branded with the scorn of almost all English writers who have dealt with their age for a hundred and fifty years. Strangely enough, even English theological thinkers, who have departed widely from orthodox positions have had very little to say in defence of this section of their free-thinking predecessors. Mr Leslie Stephen, for example, in his *History of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, seems to assent to the orthodox tradition of the madness of the opponents of the ecclesiastical giants Butler, Bentley, and Berkeley, and though they come nearer to his own views gives them very little credit either for intellectual ability or nobility of character as truth-seekers. The great divines of the eighteenth century seem to overawe even the modern rationalists, who would claim that the orthodox theology which the Deists attacked is indeed overthrown.

The ecclesiastical view of the Deists which still holds the field was well expressed by Sir James Stephen in the middle of the last century. "They are remembered, like the heroes of the 'Dunciad,' only for the brilliancy of the *auto da f* at which they suffered." Certainly no school of thought has ever had to meet so terrible an opposition. The whole weight of the Churches and of respectable men of letters, even those who sympathised with their opinions, such as Pope, for example was thrown against them. As no writers have been less read than the Deists the tradition has naturally never been questioned by the world at large, but any impartial reader of Toland, Tindal, Collins, and their followers, together with the story of their lives—spent, much of them, in flight from persecution, and in some cases in gaol—must see very soon that, whether their arguments were equal to those of their opponents or not, the men were far from being the "weak cattle" they have been represented. Though the Deists have never met with much sympathy even from their modern free-thinking successors in England, continental writers, less awed by the names of the opposition, have not failed to do justice to them. Two sympathetic historians of the movement have appeared

in Germany in Mosck and Lechler, and from Strauss onwards many German theologians, some even among the orthodox, have paid tributes to their honest work in Biblical criticism and their bold plea for liberty of thought.

One of the most distinguished of modern French religious historians, M. Ruville, has made noble recognition of the moral intention of the movement which its orthodox opponents branded as subversive of morality and religion

"Who virtue and a church alike disown

Think that but words, and this but brick and stone,"

wrote the covert Deist Pope of the Deists. Says M. Ruville:

"On many points the Deistic philosophy of the eighteenth century was incomparably more Christian than the Church. Was it ever as intolerant as the Church? What system ever waged such war against intolerance or displayed such humanity as it did? What system so took the side of knowledge and justice, or ever, since the time of Jesus Christ, so asserted the rights of the poor? When we understand something of what the philosophy of the last century had to contend with, we at least learn its courage and its relative utility, both of which we are apt to overlook."

There is, indeed, as yet no history in English doing justice to the abilities and intentions of the Deists. Mr. Hunt, in his *Religious Thought in England*, has certainly given the fullest and best account of the old controversy in the language; but though his work seems to show a higher estimate of the powers of the Deists than that of Mr. Stephen, its standpoint precludes its being satisfactory to most liberal religious thinkers. As the thought of the eighteenth century is now so completely left behind, it is not likely that any English writer will ever take the trouble to give us a complete history of the Deistic movement written without the prepossessions which two centuries of condemnation naturally engender against the school. To make the dry bones of the controversy live again to readers of the twentieth century would be an impossible task. But the Deists themselves were interesting men, who seem to live and breathe behind the cold and formal style of their age far more than most contemporary writers. An outline sketch of their opinions, not dissociated from their lives and fortunes, may still be readable even in a review of the twentieth century.

The word "deist" seems to have come first into use shortly before the beginning of the eighteenth century. Previous to that time all opponents of revelation were classed together indiscriminately under the term "atheist," or "infidel." Though the poet Marlowe and other of the literary men of the Elizabethan age seem to have been thorough-paced atheists, the probability is, in spite of the many attacks on atheism which appeared in the seventeenth century, that atheism found few adherents in England, and that most of

the heterodoxy of that time, and, indeed, till much later, was deistical.

The first writer who published an undissembled Deistic philosophy seems to have been Lord Herbert of Cherbury, the friend of Bacon, and though his influence was very small, he has been made by all writers, from Leland onwards, the founder of the English school. Herbert's Latin treatise on *Truth, as distinguished from Revelation, Probability, Possibility, and Falschood*, asserts the principle which Hobbes laid down later that a revelation can only reasonably be accepted by the person who receives it, and that only he is responsible to the Deity for its rejection or acceptance and carrying out. "There is, he urged, one universal religion with five chief articles, the knowledge of which, he claimed, is implanted in men everywhere—the existence of the Deity; that He is to be worshipped; the obligatoriness of piety and virtue; the necessity of repentance; and future rewards and punishments. Nothing further than these articles can be known except by direct personal revelation. Such a revelation, communicated by the person who receives it, cannot be accepted, because it cannot amount in the second person to certain knowledge, but is mere human testimony, on which the Deity requires no man to accept beliefs. The sources of religion are these elementary innate ideas, or "common notions" existing in all men, arrived at by natural instinct and not by reasoning processes, and direct action by the Deity on the sense perception. Lord Herbert did not deny that such revelation had possibly been made to individual men. In fact, he claimed that he had himself received a direct revelation, by thunder in the sky, in answer to a petition to the Deity for guidance as to the advisableness of publishing his treatise. But his theory obviously cuts at the root of the orthodox religion of the time, with its advancing of a revelation claimed to be so well attested by the first apostles as to make rejection of it worthy of eternal punishment. Herbert's work called forth many replies, the most celebrated being Baxter's, Locke's, and Bishop Pearson's great defence of "mediate revelation." Locke was, of course, opposed to the work philosophically as heartily as he was to its rejection of revelation. Hallam, who was the first person to give any satisfactory account of Herbert's curious work, speaks highly of its author's honesty and love of truth.

It is doubtful whether Hobbes, whom Leland and other eighteenth-century writers ranked as the chief writer of the Deistic school, really went as far as Deism in his philosophy, though a superficial perusal of the *Leviathan* is apt to give the impression that he was a Deist. The name of atheist, which was bestowed on him as on most of the English freethinkers who followed him, certainly did him less injustice than any of them; The *Leviathan* is full of personified allusions to the "great First Cause," but Hobbes

emphatically asserts that men can have no idea of Him in their minds "answerable to His nature," and, conversely, that all their ideas of Him are unrepresentative of reality. He reduces the Deity to an entirely unknown existence. As the ultimate source of all our knowledge is the impressions of sense, we necessarily, he says, in a memorable simile, stand in the same relation to the First Cause, for all purposes of acquiring knowledge of Him, as a blind man towards a fire. But that Hobbes, whatever his own philosophy amounted to, by the immensely strong influence he exerted in the direction of discrediting orthodoxy and prompting free thought, was the most powerful force which operated in the birth of the Deistic school proper at the end of the century is undeniable. No writer has poured more contempt on the authority of revelation than he in his famous *reductio ad absurdum* of its claims in the *Leviathan*:

"To say God hath spoken to him in a dream is no more than to say he dreamed that God spoke to him. To say he hath seen a vision, or heard a voice, is to say that he has dreamed between sleeping and waking. To say he speaks by supernatural inspiration is to say he finds an ardent desire to speak, or some strong opinion of himself for which he cannot allege any sufficient and natural reason."

By such passages as this Hobbes became the real father of the Deistic movement, however aloof he stands from it in his ultimate thought on the universe. Many of the immense crop of answers which Hobbes' treatise wrung from the theologians served only to show how widely uncertainty and the spirit of liberalism prevailed in the Church itself. Cudworth, the ablest of Hobbes' opponents, was by many himself ranked among the Deists for his laborious treatise, *The True Intellectual System of the Universe*. He argued with great ability for a personal Deity, the immutable distinction of right and wrong, the freedom of the will, moral responsibility, and the other philosophic ideas necessary to all theological systems which Hobbes' terrible genius had attacked; but so powerfully and fairly did he represent the theories he was opposing that his work provoked general dissatisfaction, and many found it, as Charles Lamb found his annotated Bible, suggest more difficulties than it solved. Among these was John Dryden, whom it helped to drive into the arms of Rome. "He has raised," wrote the poet, "such strong objections against the being of a God that many think he has not answered them."

The Deistic link between Hobbes and Toland is found by Leland, the last-century historian and critic of the movement, in Blount, who began his literary career in 1679 by publishing a work called *Animæ Mundi*, containing an account of the opinions of the ancient philosophers on the question of the immortality of the soul, with a bias against the doctrine. This was followed up by a translation of part of Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius Tyaneus*, the Pagan philosopher

and the martyr of the early days of Christianity, whose extraordinary career, now known to every one in the brilliant account of Froude, was then first placed before unscholarly English readers. Blount's intention of discrediting the Christian miracles was of course sufficiently obvious. After a short life spent largely, like those of his more famous Deistic successors, in political strife, Blount in 1693 committed suicide through a love disappointment. His name will ever be secure from oblivion for his opposition to the licensing law and the subtle plot by which he compassed the removal of Edmund Bohun, the licenser, and indirectly brought about the liberty of the press. Gildon, the political hack whom Pope has damned to everlasting fame, published several of his works, which had been left in manuscript, posthumously, one of them being a defence of suicide, the second of three famous English justifications of suicide to appear, the first having been written by the poet Donne, and the third being Hume's famous suppressed essay, also published posthumously. Another of Blount's works edited by Gildon, and perhaps partly written by him, was *The Oracles of Reason*, the most characteristically Deistic of all Blount's writings, made up largely of a strong attack on the mediatorial scheme of Christian theology. It argued rather subtly against the theologians that the Deity's determination to provide a mediator which was a fact of their scheme, was a proof that He was already reconciled to man before the Incarnation and that there was no need of such a plan. This apparent contradiction in the orthodox theology of course gave opportunity for fine displays of metaphysical ingenuity on the part of opponents. Blount in this work accepted all Herbert's cardinal articles and added several others, but though more orthodox fundamentally than in his earlier treatises, he is as resolutely opposed as ever to revelation. Later in life Gildon, 'now become penitent,' as an old ecclesiastical historian expresses it, attacked his old master's positions piously in a work called *The Deist's Manual*.

In 1698 the Boyle lectures were instituted and Bentley brought his massive learning and strong reasoning powers to bear on the freethinkers. He boasted later that "the atheists remained silent or took refuge in Deism after this assault." The boast was quite without justification, for there had been no atheists in England who had not professed Deism. Certainly the lectures were followed by a great growth of Deism, whether sincere, or only veiled atheism as Bentley supposed. Indeed the Boyle lectures seemed to open the gates for the Deistic revolt to burst forth in full tide over English literature, and the posthumous works of Blount were followed a year later by the initial work of Toland, the first of the famous trio completed by Collins and Tindal.

John Toland, who was born in Ireland in the year 1670, has

strong claim to the distinction of having been the best abused man in the history of English literature. "In his lifetime," says Mr. Hunt, "he had more sermons preached against him than any other man since the days of Simon Magus or Alexander the Coppersmith." His character was consistently blackened and his abilities disparaged and ridiculed by all the divines and respectable authors of England for a century. In fact the "ordinary man" of the period must have wondered greatly that a person who was universally described as infamous and contemptible should yet call forth such a storm of refutations from the most illustrious divines. The answer of a certain Irish peer to the question why he no longer attended church, "Once I heard something of Jesus Christ, but now all the discourse is about one Toland," illustrates the tumult which the Deistic champion aroused in the Church. The work which was thought worthy of so much condemnation was *Christianity not Mysteries*, written while its author was a student at Oxford. Toland had had the advantage of education at Glasgow, Edinburgh, Leyden and Oxford, and the friendship of Le Clerc and Locke, and in spite of contemporary abuse, the more impartial scholarship of the nineteenth century has decided that his name is not unworthy to be connected with those great men. Of his character the worst that can really be said was that he was inordinately vain, very indiscreet, and lacking in ballast. Instead of keeping his opinions to himself it was his custom to "clamour in coffee houses," and so draw down on himself more persecution than he need have suffered. Though his life was a long struggle against poverty and persecution no serious crime has ever been laid to his account, though general charges of moral infamy were constantly levelled against him. *Christianity not Mysteries* seems to a twentieth century theological student an extremely moderate treatise, and it is difficult to imagine that there was ever a time when it should have been thought worthy of being burnt by the public hangman as was decreed in 1697. Its doctrine on the Trinitarian question was Socinian, like that which Locke put forward in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*, and, in spite of its, at first sight, aggressive title, "a treatise showing there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to reason or above it, and that no Christian doctrine can be properly called a mystery," the views of the book on the contents of Christianity do not, when thoroughly examined, appear very different from the conception of Christianity which prevailed among liberal Churchmen of the age as represented by such writers as Samuel Clarke and Hoadly. It is directed more against High Church theories than against the idea of Christianity as a revelation attested by miracles. Mr. Hunt has shown how little there was in its central philosophy to justify the common consideration of it as altogether exceptional.

The work, like those of nearly all the Deists, rests upon the

philosophy of Locke, and, indeed, almost all that it says had been said before by Locke, either in his *Essay* or in his *Reasonableness of Christianity*. Christianity is asserted to contain nothing mysterious, only in the sense that its doctrines, though revealed, are, when revealed, perfectly conceivable by the mind and within the scope of human ideas. The Scriptures, it is claimed, never call that a mystery "which is incomprehensible in itself, however much revealed." With the "doctrine and example of Christ" Toland professes to agree, but he objects that "many other things are imposed on men as necessary to be believed concerning Christ Jesus, as to his Divinity, Incarnation, and the Hypostatical union of both natures, which perplex and confound our understandings; and yet these things are not only delivered as mysteries of the Christian faith, but the belief of them is required as necessary to the salvation of sinners; whereas," he says, "if they are revealed they are no longer mysteries, and if they are not revealed how come they to be made articles of faith? The Scripture," he continues, "knows of no other mysteries of faith but such as were hidden before the revelation of them; but since they are revealed they are plain and open to all men's capacities, and therefore it is a great injury to the plainness and simplicity of the Gospel to impose such incomprehensible mysteries as necessary articles of faith; and it is abusing the credulity of mankind to make such things necessary to be believed which are impossible to be understood."

All knowledge, says Toland, in setting forth the limits of human understanding to the bounds of which revelation has been thus adapted, consists in the "clear and distinct ideas," received either by the intromission of the senses or by the reflection of the mind on its own operations.

Reasoning is the discovery of the agreement or disagreement of ideas by the use of intermediate ideas. When we can have no clear and distinct ideas for reason to operate on we can never arrive at knowledge. On this theory all the "mysteries" of the Church mentioned above are outside the scope of knowledge, for neither by sensation nor reflection can we gain "clear and distinct ideas" upon them. Propositions which assert that there are two natures in one person and three persons in one substance are entirely meaningless, in that we have no ideas corresponding to their terms. The true Scriptural revelation, it is asserted, contains nothing thus incomprehensible, all revealed truth being from the sphere of truths which are perfectly capable of human understanding, though they may not perhaps be discoverable by the unaided mind.

The treatise, based as it was on his *Essay*, got Locke into immediate trouble. As he was known to be a friend of Toland it was naturally thought that the treatise represented his views, and had at least been seen by him before publication. Stillingfleet, in his

Vindication of the Trinity, classed the great philosopher, to his no small annoyance, with "the gentlemen of the new way of reasoning," meaning the opponents of the traditional theology, and Locke was put to the trouble of writing half a folio volume in vindicating the agreement of his philosophy of knowledge with the orthodox doctrines. Stillingfleet insinuated that Locke also (for he assumed that Toland's views amounted to denial of substance) did not really believe in the existence of substance either, in spite of all he had said in his *Essay* on the subject, but had "discarded it out of the universe" by making it a mere capacity of producing ideas in men instead of a reality. Toland's treatise was only a logical application of Locke's philosophy to religion. Stillingfleet, who was one of the acutest thinkers as well as the deepest scholar of the age, at once saw the incompatibility of the historic theology with the "experientialism" which denied the mind the power, admitted by the opposing philosophers of the previous age, Gassendi and Descartes, of having knowledge where it has no image or imaginative delineation.

Toland did not reject the Gospel miracles, any more than Locke had done. They were in his view real occurrences, but wrought by natural laws not yet discovered, and in no way "mysteries." Locke had taken the same view without attracting any great opposition, having described them as "sensible operations, which being above the comprehension of the spectator, are *in his opinion* contrary to the course of nature and taken by him to be divino."

The title of Toland's book and the revolutionary character it assumed to a superficial reader from the ultimate nature of its inquiry caused immediate alarm, and its author was prosecuted and forced to fly the country. How necessary was his flight is shown by the fact that the very same year a person was hanged in England for expressing unfamiliar views of the miracles only in conversation. Dr. South congratulated Parliament on the country's being rid of the heretic "without the aid of a faggot," and this congratulation is not to be taken, as a twentieth-century reader is apt to believe, as one of the doctor's famous sallies of humour, but as made in sober solemnity.

A year later Toland edited Milton's prose works, and wrote his life. We now know that the great poet's theological beliefs more nearly resembled his biographer's than the world then imagined, and that Toland was not so unfit for the office he took upon himself as the religious world proclaimed. Toland has the distinction of having in this work been the first writer to question Charles's authorship of the *Ikon Basilike*, and to attribute it to Dr. Gauden. He drew the deduction that the Gospels might similarly have been attributed to writers who had nothing to do with their composition.

"When I seriously consider," he says, speaking of the attributing of the book to Charles and its reception as his, "how all this happened among

ourselves within the compass of forty years in a time of great learning and politeness, when both parties so narrowly watched over one another's actions, and what a great revolution in civil and religious affairs was partly occasioned by the credit of that book, I cease to wonder any longer how so many supposititious pieces under the name of Christ, His apostles, and other great persons should be published and approved in those primitive times, when it was of so much importance to have them believed; when the cheats were too many on all sides for them to reproach one another, which yet they often did; when commerce was not near so general as now, and the whole earth entirely overpread with the darkness of superstition. I doubt rather the spuriousness of several more such books is yet undiscovered through the remoteness of those ages, the death of the persons concerned, and the decay of other monuments which might give us true information."

His poverty had now, however, become great, and when the answers to this piece of very natural scepticism appeared, he claimed in a work called *Amyntor* that he had only meant to refer to the apocryphal gospels, and soon after for the sake of peace and an income made a recantation of all in his writings that had been judged heretical. He found political occupation as a writer in favour of the Act of Succession, and accompanied the mission which presented the Act to the Electress Sophia. He also made his way to the court of the Electress's daughter, the brilliant Queen Sophie Charlotte of Prussia, and made a reputation there by his philosophic and theological conversation. Among the great men with whom he was associated in the palace at Charlottenburg were Leibnitz, Handel, Beausobre the Protestant theologian, and Papendorf the Jesuit. He disputed with the two latter, and delighted the Queen by his bold and liberal views. After the accession of Anne he was employed on the continent by the Whig government, but little of a detailed kind is known of his subsequent career.

In the next reign he recommenced the publication of his liberal views, and in 1720 his most remarkable work, the *Pantheisticon*, appeared. The work, which was the first published in England which showed the influence of Spinoza, contains an exposition of the doctrines of a supposed society of pantheists. Toland had now become completely alienated even from the most liberal Christian position, and was no longer even a Deist. His philosophy was mere Spinozism, though in some minor points he was opposed to and had attacked his master's system. "In mundo omnia sunt unum," he declares, "unumque est omne in omnibus. Quod omne in omnibus Deus est: æternus ac immensus; neque genitus neque interitus. In eo vivimus movemur et existemus. Ab eo natum est unumquidque, in eumque denuo revoluturum; omnium ipse principium et finis."

This last treatise set the mark of utter infamy on its author, who was always distinguished by apologetic writers from his Deistic comrades as the grand villain of the movement. But time has

softened the harshness of theological controversy and wiped away the stigma from the name of Toland, and the finest and most warm-hearted tribute to the seventeenth-century heretic can be quoted from an orthodox theologian of the twentieth.

"Toland," says Mr. Hunt, "died suddenly, at the age of fifty-two, in his lodging at Putney, and was buried in Putney churchyard. A hundred and fifty summer suns have set since then. No tombstone ever marked the place where his ashes repose. He may have been vain, perhaps he was impolitic, certainly he was unfortunate; but he was one of the world's great men. Every man who thinks and feels, whether he be a sceptic or a believer, will drop a tear of sympathy by the grave of poor John Toland."

His Latin epitaph, written by himself, ended thus: "His soul is reunited to his Heavenly Father, from whom it formerly proceeded; his body, yielding to Nature, is also replaced in the bosom of mother earth. He himself will surely rise to eternal life, but he will never again be the same Toland." Few men have had greater reason to look forward with pleasure to the loss of individuality which is expected in the last line of this profession of faith, for few men's memories can have had bitterer contents.

Toland's works, unfortunately for their general popularity, were entirely lacking in all grace of style. They appealed only to readers whose interests were primarily theological and philosophic. The contemporary ecclesiastical historian, Mosheim, who was one of Toland's ablest critics, condemns their "brutal rusticity and uncomeliness" and all the orthodox writers poured contempt on their obvious want of elegance of form. In the Earl of Shaftesbury, who continued the campaign against the traditional theology, the Church found an opponent as well able to compare with any of its champions as a writer as Toland had proved in learning. The influence of the *Characteristics*, which appeared in their first form from 1708-11, was immense among the cultured classes. Shaftesbury did not, like the other Deists, attack the orthodox doctrine openly. But he made his contempt for it appear sufficiently by ignoring its existence as a philosophy of the universe and a force in life, and here and there by subtle satire. Pope gave it as his conviction that Shaftesbury had done more to discredit revelation by his silence on the subject than any other writer of the age. His obviously sincere attacks on atheism and his vindication of the inherent distinction between right and wrong, which Hobbes had striven to undermine, made him more dangerous to the Church. No one could possibly charge him, as Toland was charged, with being an atheistic and immoral writer. He was a thoroughly religious type, and only from the orthodox standpoint imperfect, not erroneous. In preaching Providence, resignation to the Supreme will, and an optimistic theory of life, he was unsurpassed by the divines themselves. Thus he made his way into

Vol. 156.—No. 6. 2 U

the houses of the orthodox, where the other Deists never found entry, and undermined revelation in the home of its own adherents. What objection which would convince young and impressionable readers, already captivated by his fine style, could the clergy make against the religious character of a man who wrote in such a strain as this?

"For our part, let us make the most of life and the least of death. The certain way for this being (as I conceive) to do the most good, and that the most freely and generously, throwing aside selfishness, mercenariness, and such servile thoughts as unfit us for this world and much more for a better. Let every one answer for their own experience and speak of happiness and good as they find it. Thank heaven, I can do good and find heaven in it. I know nothing else that is heavenly. And if this disposition fits me not for heaven, I desire never to be fitted for it nor to come into the place. I ask no reward from heaven for that, which is reward itself. Let my being be continued or discontinued, as in the main is best. The Author of it best knows and I trust Him with it. To me it is indifferent and always shall be so. I have never yet served God or man but as I loved and liked, having been true to my own and family motto, which is 'Love, Serve.'"

Anthony Collins, whose first important work appeared in the year of Shaftesbury's death, had, like him, the advantage, in attempting to undermine the current theology, of starting the campaign with a good and unsuspected religious character. He was well born, had been educated at Eton and Cambridge, and had gained the friendship and warm admiration of Locke. A year before his death the old philosopher wrote to his young pupil in such terms as these:

"I am overjoyed with an intimation I have received also, that gives me hopes of seeing you here the next week. You are a charitable good friend, and are resolved to make the decays and dregs of my life the pleasantest part of it. For I know nothing calls me so much back to a pleasant sense of enjoyment, and makes my days so gay and lively, as your good company. Come, then, and multiply happy minutes upon, and rejoice here in the good you do, me."

A few months later Locke wrote him a commendation which any living thinker in his prime might have envied:

"You complain of a great many defects, and that very complaint is the highest recommendation I could desire to make me love and esteem you and desire your friendship. And if I were now setting out in the world, I should think it my great happiness to have such a companion as you who had a true relish of Truth and would in earnest seek it with me, from whom I might receive it undisguised, and to whom I might communicate what I thought true freely. Believe it, my good friend, to love Truth for truth's sake is the principal part of human perfection in this world and the seed-plot of all other virtues, and, if I mistake not, you have as much of it as I ever met with in any body. What, then, is wanting to make you equal to the best; a friend for any one to be proud of?"

Four years before the appearance of his *Discourse on Freethinking* Collins had made a great impression by an anonymous work entitled

Priestcraft in Perfection, in which he maintained, in opposition to the High Church party, that the first clause in the twentieth of the Thirty-nine Articles, ascribing authority to the Church in matters of faith, was a fraudulent interpolation, bringing forward as his grounds the fact that it was not to be found in two MSS. of the Articles among Parker's papers, subscribed by two Convocations in 1562 and 1571. The replies were numerous, and Collier, the non-juring Church historian, attacked the theory strongly in the latter part of his great work. In 1711 Collins went to Holland and gained the friendship of Le Clerc, who commended him in terms as high as those of Locke. The *Discourse on Freethinking* did not any more than Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*, openly question the current theological beliefs or declare that they were unable to bear the examination of free reason. Its chief offence was that it advocated a free criticism of the Scriptures and insinuated that they were of uncertain authority, owing to the probability of corruption by the Fathers and from the many different readings in the text just collected and published by Dr. Mills. In a long list of the great "free thinkers" of the world, Collins included the ancient prophets, who, he says, "writ with as great liberty against the established religion of the Jews, which the people looked on as the institution of God Himself, as if they looked upon it all to be an imposture," and many of the most distinguished modern philosophers and theologians. One of the best pieces of satire in the book is the eulogy of the newly formed Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, as a body founded for the "purpose of acquainting the heathen that it is their duty to think freely both on the notions of God and religion which they had received from their ancestors, or which are established by law among them, and on those new notions of God and religion brought to them by the missionaries of the Church of England. The institution of this society," he adds, "supposes free thinking to be the duty of all men on the face of the earth, and upon that account I cannot sufficiently commend the design." A subtle attack on the Christian ethic is made in praising Epicurus for being eminent in that "most divine of all virtues, friendship," on the ground that "even our holy religion itself does not anywhere particularly require of us this virtue." The essay, though it was immediately driven into contempt by Bentley's famous reply, is really an exceedingly clever and forcible piece of writing. Bentley's criticism which was so effective and has been the subject of so much eulogy was, however skilful, a very unfair piece of controversial writing. Its roughness and insolence of tone are quite beyond justification, for Collins, whatever his opinions, had written as a gentleman. Some of the contentions of the *Discourse* are misrepresented in a most shameful way, and even printers' errors are taken advantage of to ridicule Collins's learning and reasoning powers. Mark Pattison's judgment that

Bentley's criticism is finer than his *Phalaris* discourse, is only possible to a man who has never read the work criticised.

After another trip to Holland Collins followed up the impression which the last work had made by a blow at the very root of all theologies, the doctrine of the freedom of the will. In his *Philosophic Enquiry concerning Human Liberty*, a work which deserves to give him a recognised position among English philosophical writers, he contended, in the now familiar manner, that all phenomena of volition are the results of a mechanical battle of motives, the mind being invincibly determined by its predominant motive, and entirely without liberty of choice. "This work is the only one of Collins's, and almost the only one which the theological controversy of the first half of the eighteenth century produced, worth perusal to-day. Locke had not satisfied the theologians by his opinions on the fundamental question of liberty, and their exact nature has never been thoroughly determined. Whether he believed that the mind in any given instance can act otherwise than it does is doubtful. Collins, his pupil, is a thorough-going determinist, admitting only what he calls "external liberty," or the power of making choice effectual. To the usual objection from conscience to his theory he replies that self-accusation "is only the sense of having acted against some rules which on reflection we apprehend it would have been better for us to have followed, though it did not appear so when we did the action." Among the most resolute of Collins's numerous opponents was the profound Samuel Clarke, who, though sometimes ranking himself with the Deists, whatever his lapses from orthodox standards on other questions, was unhesitatingly orthodox on this cardinal doctrine of all theologies. Collins seems to have held the orthodox view of personality, and not to have regarded the mind as merely a sum of experience unrelated to an individual substance, and can hardly therefore be connected with the modern necessitarian school represented by such a work as Taine's brilliant *Essay on Human Intelligence*.

In 1724 Collins, with his character for respectability now gone, turned to biblical criticism and published in a *Discourse on the Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion* a vigorous attack on the argument from prophecy, following it up three years later by *The Literal Scheme of Prophecy Considered*, an answer to the numerous replies. In both works he endeavoured to show that the prophecies relied upon by theological apologists, which he assumes to be the only serious supports of orthodoxy, were all capable of other senses than those traditionally placed upon them, and that many of them, particularly those of Daniel, were written "after the events." Such of them as were not of these classes and had been undoubtedly fulfilled he declared to be mere examples of "natural divination." Just as the old Roman priesthood, he says, "learnt

that art in schools or under discipline, so the Jews did prophesying in the schools and colleges of the prophets." Collins was, it would seem, the earliest English writer to set forth the now almost universally received opinion of the Book of Daniel, that it was written in the second century B.C. for the encouragement of the Jews under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanus. Scientific criticism in the region of biblical criticism, insight into the nature of the Hebrew imagination and literary methods were then unborn, and the *Book of Daniel* was universally considered as of necessity either an imposture or a true prophecy of future events. That ordinary narratives of past events should have been thrown into prophetic form for literary effect by the eastern mind two thousand years before was something which the prosaic Chancellors, Landowners, and Newtons, with all their erudition, could not understand. Collins died in 1729. His character was universally admitted to be of great uprightness and nobility, and his bitterest enemies never dared to attack him as a man. He held a high civic appointment in his native county of Essex, and this, with his distinguished birth and ample means, saved him from the contempt of the other Deistic writers. He seems, though intensely devoted to his critical and philosophic opinions, to have had a considerable fear of losing his ancestral respectability, for nearly all his works appeared anonymously, and several times, when their contents had caused considerable indignation, he expressed regret that his writings should be regarded as dangerous and immoral in their tendency. He seems even to have promised his opponents not to republish his essay on Liberty. According to Chalmers' Life he resolutely upheld all his opinions when urged to recant at his death.

The way had been prepared for this minimising of current Christian doctrine by the two treatises of the unfortunate Thomas Woolston, the most vigorous and effective of all the lesser Deistic writers. As Collins had attacked the argument from prophecy, Woolston set himself to complete the destruction of supernatural religion by disposing of the miracles. An opposition to all the Gospel miracles had been by no means a note of the earlier Deistic school. Many of the Deists had with Locke allowed that the "republication of the religion of nature," had been attended with wonders. But Woolston would have nothing to do with miracles, great or small. In his two *Discourses on the Gospel Miracles*, without any of Tindal's regard for the feelings of orthodox believers, he treats the Gospel narrative in the most contemptuous manner and pours liberal abuse on all the orthodox champions. He contended that if the miracle stories were taken in their literal sense as an account of fact, the marvellous events could only have been "absurd tricks, miserable farces or vulgar deceptions." The story of the raising of Lazarus is described as "such a contexture of folly and

found as is not to be equalled in all romantic history, and the Resurrection narrative as "a complication of circumstances, incoherences and mistakes." The only reasonable standpoint to take in regard to such stories was "to sacrifice their historical character, and no longer to consider them than as the representation, under the form or guise of real events, of certain spiritual truths." Origen, Augustine and others of the Fathers are constantly quoted as sanctioning this mode of interpreting the Gospels, though without admission of the fact that they held the literal truth of the narratives as well as saw allegorical meanings in them. The two treatises sold in thousands, and nearly a hundred replies to them have been enumerated, Sherlock's famous *Trial of the Witnesses of Christ's Resurrection* being the chief. Woolston paid dearly for his boldness in putting his name to such open attacks on the current creed. He was heavily fined, and being, like most of his Deistic comrades, extremely impecunious, was thrown into prison, where he lingered until his death in 1733. The anonymous writer of a small *Life of Woolston*, dated 1733, declares that "the greatest obstruction to his deliverance from confinement was the obligation which he was under to give security for his not offending again by any future writings, an office which he would not impose on any friend because he was resolved not only to write again, but as freely as he had before." His character is described by the same writer, evidently a Deist himself, as "that of an exemplary, meek and temperate person; and he has often declared to myself and many others of his friends that if he was possessed of more than £60 a year he could not spend more on himself, so great was the pleasure which he found in temperance." Woolston, though he compared the Gospels to *Gulliver's Travels*, was at heart a really religious man. He claimed that all his writings were "for the honour of the Holy Jesus and in defence of Christianity," and his last words, as quoted by his gaoler, were: "This is a struggle which all men must go through, and which I bear not only patiently but willingly." The works of Woolston and Tindal were succeeded by a crowd of treatises making for the same conclusions from minor pens, many of them more rude and forceful than elegant or scholarly.

Thomas Morgan, a poor farmer's son, who had been charitably educated for the Nonconformist ministry, published in 1787 *The Moral Philosopher*, in which he denied quaintly that the Deity had ever communicated His mind by revelation, and maintained that all miracles, wherever related, were "tricks of imposture." The work was in the dialogue form, then so much affected, the debaters being styled a "Christian Deist" and a "Christian Jew." Morgan seems to have escaped punishment by the secular arm though he naturally lost his living in the Nonconformist ministry. Another smaller writer, Annet, who dared to attempt a refutation of the *Moral Philosopher*,

Woolston was less fortunate, being pilloried and thrown into prison well known.

Tindal, the third member of the famous Deistic trio, though born earlier than either of the others, was the last to make his mark as a Deistic writer. His great work *Christianity as Old as Creation*, the last he wrote, appeared the year after the death of Toland and Collins. Like Gibbon later, Tindal in early life was for a time a Roman Catholic, and on becoming conscious of "the absurdities of Popery" broke with all kinds of Christian orthodoxy. Unlike Gibbon, Tindal had a brilliant University career, graduating Doctor of Civil Law, and becoming a Fellow of All Souls College. Before composing his *magnum opus*, he had written strongly against the High Church party, and had gained a wide reputation as a jurist, having been early in life consulted by Government on a point of international law. *Christianity as Old as Creation* may be said to have raised the Deistic movement to its high-water mark. It became immediately popular, and its effects on the religious thought of the country seem for a time to have been immense. Nearly a hundred and fifty replies have been enumerated, all the leading theologians deeming it their duty to make an effort to crush the book.

Tindal, like most of the other Deists, professed the greatest devotion to Christianity at the outset of his treatise, and declared that "stripped of the additions which policy, mistake, and the circumstances of time have made to it, it is a most holy religion, and all its doctrines plainly speak themselves to be the will of an infinitely wise and good God." But the doctrines of which he desired to strip it were the central doctrines of the orthodox theology. Original Christianity was, he maintained, only the confirming and reviving of the religious sentiments which rose naturally in the hearts of all men, and the just views of the Deity which right reason must always arrive at. It contained nothing that men could not discover and had not discovered for themselves. All such doctrines as the Trinity and the Atonement were, it followed, accretions. A revelation in the orthodox sense was, he declared, entirely unnecessary, and would argue that God had failed originally to provide men with a sufficient guide to the great truths of existence. "No religion," he says, "can come from a being of absolute wisdom and perfection, but what is absolutely perfect. A religion absolutely perfect can admit of no alteration, and can be capable of no addition or diminution. If God has given mankind such a law, He must likewise have given them a sufficient means of knowing it; He would otherwise have defeated his own interest in giving it, since a law so far as it is unintelligible ceases to be a law." Early in life Tindal seems to have held this view of the unnecessary character of external revelation. At Oxford it was said by one who knew him there, he used to contend in conversation "that there neither is nor can be

any revealed religion, that God has given man reason for his guide, that this guide is sufficient for man's direction without revelation, and that therefore, since God does nothing "in vain, there can be no such thing as revelation, to which he added that he made no doubt but that within such a number of years all men of sense would settle in natural religion." Among the scholars of the college to whom Tindal would propound these views was Young of the *Night Thoughts*, and he confessed that the poet used to give him very considerable trouble with his objections.

Tindal's *Christianity not Mystrious*, is the typical representative of the strictly Deistic school of the time, and in a general way of the theological thought of the age. It was based on Locke's philosophy, and in its fundamental ideas does not depart from current theological conceptions. Its Deity is the traditional Roman Deity, external to the universe, and the idea of revelation—for he admitted that Christianity was a revelation, though of nothing new—is the current mechanical idea. To men who accepted the theological and philosophical ideas of the age, it was, however, a work which it was difficult to answer, and one can well understand that to many thinkers of the class of Warburton, Tindal should have seemed really what the learned bishop satirically called him, a "mighty author."

Thomas Chubb, one of the most extraordinary men of the age, and well deserving the description Pope gave of him as "the wonderful phenomenon of Wilts," in that he became a learned man and an expert controversialist without education and while earning his living as a tallow chandler, did as much as any Deistic writer to propagate Deism among the lower classes. From Arianism he passed on to pure Deism, finally questioning immortality and asserting the uselessness of prayer. No revelation, he urged, was required to inculcate any of the Christian precepts of morality, all of them being obvious without it. Chubb wisely reserved his most heretical works for posthumous publication, but during his life he wrote with great boldness and at times proved a very awkward antagonist even to the most learned divines. The once famous controversialist, Dr. Stebbing, for example, received the unpleasant demand to give up some of his numerous livings and richly paid secure Church offices if he really desired to show his devotion to Christianity. This sort of argument naturally appealed strongly to the lower classes, and must have caused considerable disinclination to join issue with its sturdy advancer among many of the bishops and other dignitaries who were reposing peacefully in studious ease in mansions among the lakes hundreds of miles away from their cures.

At the moment when the clergy were most busily engaged in defending the super-rational articles of the creed as divinely revealed and necessary to be believed, and the minds of half the thinking

part of the nation were in a state of complete indecision regarding them, one of the subtlest of the Deistic writers, a young and unknown man, named Henry Dodwell, took brilliant advantage of the opportunity to strike a decisive blow at revelation. In a work entitled *Christianity Not Founded on Argument* he cleverly turned the hundreds of learned and laborious treatises which the divines had put forth in vindication of their super-rational revealed doctrines to the service of Deism. Under the pretence of zeal for orthodox Christianity, but really from a very different motive, he contended that the historic Christian scheme could not be proved divine by reason, and that men were not intended to be converted to it by mere evidence, as though its doctrines were scientific propositions. "Assent to revealed truth founded upon conviction of the understanding is," he wrote, "a false and unwarrantable notion." The only ground and rule of faith was the illumination of the Holy Spirit. This seemed nothing less than the forced surrender by a zealous Churchman of the whole controversial field to the enemy. No argumentative device could have been better contrived to dispose the average undecided English mind against the old beliefs. Mysticism of all kinds has always been obnoxious to the English mind, and never more so than in the early eighteenth century. To base the ancient doctrines upon it in this way was to strike the most effective blow at them. It associated Christianity with Behmenism on one side and with the rising Methodists on the other. Though the average mind was easily deceived by the treatise many of the divines both of the Church and dissenting bodies saw the intention of Dodwell's essay and there was the usual crop of replies. Dr. Doddridge, who was in the habit of declaring that the evidences of Christianity were so clear that they could be made plain to any honest ploughman, led the van of attack with an able exposure of the work, and even the mystical William Law wrote indignantly against its doctrines.

But successful as Dodwell's work undoubtedly was as a blow against the Church, it seems to have been the last of any importance written in the interests of Deism. Bolingbroke's posthumous works which appeared ten years later, though the most brilliant of the whole Deistic series, mark the end of Deistic rationalism as a combative force in literature. In David Hume's essays, a powerful force had begun to operate on the mind of the country which was as destructive of the old Deism as it was of orthodoxy. No doubt at the onslaught of Hume's many of the Deistically inclined, from sheer intellectual despair, returned to orthodox allegiance. Butler's great argument had also appeared a few years before Dodwell's essay, which itself was as good an argument for Atheism as the Deism which he is supposed to have intended it to buttress. "Hume's scepticism," says Noack, in his work on Deism, "brings the Deistic development in

England to a close," and Mr. Lecky is of opinion that by the middle of the century, the Deistic writers had fallen into complete neglect. Mr. Robertson in his *History of Free Thought*, however, maintains that the traditional view on this subject is erroneous, and that Deism remained a popular creed until a much later period. He brings evidence to show that when Burke in 1790 asked his famous question—"who born within the last forty years has read one word of Collins and Toland and Tindal, of Chubb and Morgan, and the whole race who called themselves Freethinkers. Who now reads Bolingbroke? who ever read him through? Ask the booksellers of London what has become of all these lights of the world!" and added "In a few years their few successors will go to the family vault of all the Capulets"—Bolingbroke at least was still one of the greatest favourites in the fashionable world. The fact, however, remains that written defences of Deism which in the first half of the century had appeared by scores, practically ceased after 1754. Their place seems to have been taken by Unitarian and Broad Church treatises, such as Priestley's and Parr's, approaching much more nearly to orthodox positions than Tindal and Bolingbroke. Moreover, it does not follow from the fact that he was read, that his philosophy of the universe was generally accepted. On the whole there seems to be very good reason for the traditional supposition that Bolingbroke was not only the last considerable Deistic writer, but among the last of the old-fashioned Deistic thinkers also.

The work by which Bolingbroke made the widest impression was his brilliantly written *Letters on the Use and Study of History*, full of the most contemptuous allusions to the Old Testament, to the value of the Gospels as historical documents, and to the clergy who "abuse by misrepresentation and false quotation the history they can no longer corrupt," as the arch enemies of true historical judgments. The Old Testament he called "a heap of fables which can pretend to nothing but some inscrutable truths and therefore useless to mankind" and "full of additions, interpolations and transpositions." The Gospels he brought down to the second and even the third century. The most unintelligent reader, who was dead to all the reasoning of the philosophical works was startled and impressed by statements of this sort, especially when they were made in the most dignified manner, and the whole work in which they appeared, wore the most scrupulous appearance of impartiality.

Bolingbroke's posthumously published philosophic works, have perhaps been unduly depreciated. Every writer who has dealt with them has had something to say of their superficiality, their prolix and high-flown rhetoric, but the real acuteness and force of much of the reasoning they contain has been less often recognised. Apart from qualities of this order, they are pervaded with that human dignity of sentiment which was in Bolingbroke as in some of the

contemplation even in the Augustan age. A strain of noble resignation to the will of the Deity and to the annihilation which he looked on as following death, runs through them, which seems a genuine echo of the old Stoics. It has been the fashion to consider Bolingbroke as merely playing a part in these elevated passages, and it is true enough that there was almost as much insincerity in him as in the disciple to whom he addressed his philosophic thoughts. A very little reflection on human nature will show, however, that even the assumption of such an attitude could only have come from a genuine feeling of its dignity. But Bolingbroke maintained the attitude of his writings on his death-bed, and there is not the least evidence that his undoubted love of affectation did more than merely colour the presentment of a philosophy genuinely believed.

Bolingbroke was a thorough-going Deist with a hatred of all theories that verged on Pantheism. Collins and Toland he looked upon as Atheists, and liked them even less than the clergy. The grand pillar of his philosophic system was the assertion that we can have no true ideas of the moral attributes of the Deity, His goodness and justice, as we can of His physical attributes, His wisdom and His power. All the knowledge God has given us means to acquire of His attributes, he says, is to be derived from His works, and from the tenor of the providence by which He governs them. We have no direct knowledge of Him:

"Every part of the immense universe and the order and harmony of the whole, as far as we are able to carry our observations and discoveries, are not only conformable to our ideas of wisdom and power, but these ideas were impressed originally and principally by them on every attentive mind, and men were led to conclude with the utmost certainty that a Being of infinite wisdom and power made, preserved, and governed the system. As far as we can discern, we discern these in all His works, and where we cannot discern them it is manifestly due to our imperfection, not to His. God cannot be in any instance unwise or impotent. This, now, is real knowledge, or there is no such thing as knowledge. We acquire it immediately in the objects themselves, in God and in Nature, the work of God. We know what wisdom and power are; we know both instinctively and by the help of our senses that such as we conceive them to be such they appear in the work, and therefore we know demonstratively that such they are in the worker."

On the other hand our ideas of goodness and justice, "obtained merely from the obligations under which we lie to one another by the constitution of our nature," are not necessarily answerable to these qualities in the Deity. We can only, Bolingbroke says, ascribe these moral qualities to Him whenever He intended that we should—that is whenever His works communicate these ideas as necessarily as the spectacle of the universe communicates the ideas of wisdom and power. Whenever they are not so communicated we may assume very reasonably that it is on motives strictly conformable to all the divine attributes, and therefore, to goodness and justice though unknown to us.

This theory is seen at once on examination to be a blow at the very root of Christianity in all its forms. That part of the Deity's providence which impresses us with our imperfect ideas of goodness and justice represents, says Bolingbroke, goodness and justice as goodness and justice exist in the Deity. When, on the other hand, His providence impresses us with the very contrary qualities of cruelty and injustice, we, nevertheless, are to believe that that part of it also expresses the same goodness and justice as the exactly contrary phenomena which agree with human notions of goodness and justice. In other words our notions of benevolence and cruelty, though contradictory, both agree with benevolence as it is in the Deity, and as it is therefore in its real nature. Bolingbroke thus sets before us for our adoration an all-perfect Being whose attributes we condemn when exhibited in men, and makes all the ideas of men on the subject of moral right and wrong ridiculous.

However content a philosopher like Bolingbroke might be in contemplating and resigning himself to the will of a Deity, whose moral attributes are not the same as in man's ideas, such a Being failed entirely to satisfy the requisitions of the religious natures of the majority. An omnipotent Being who was possibly malevolent, as the poet Gray pointed out in one of the ablest rejoinders to Bolingbroke, was no consolation to anybody.

Deism in Bolingbroke thus at length became irreligious, and ceasing entirely to satisfy the elementary religious instincts of men, became a mere philosophy, and lost the hold it had gained in the hands of some of the earlier writers on the masses. Bolingbroke in fact did more to discredit Deism and to arouse hostility against all bold speculation on theological and philosophic questions than any of his opponents. Even Burke, in his speech supporting the liberation of Nonconformists from the obligation of subscription to the Anglican Articles, in his fear of the social consequences of the acceptance of Bolingbroke's doctrines, declared that while orthodox Dissenters should be freed from all restraint Freethinkers were "outlaws of the human race" and were "never to be supported, never to be tolerated."

The work of the Deistic school, which thus came to an end with Bolingbroke, is concisely summed up by Noack, in his history of the movement, as follows :—

"Toland stripped Christianity of its mysteries, which, he said, had only been the means of education and civilisation; Collins acquired for the Deists the name of Freethinkers and refuted the ordinary proofs of the prophecies and miracles which are given in support of supernatural revelation; Shaftesbury considered the chief and eternal truth of Christianity to consist in morality, upon which happiness is eternally and necessarily dependent; Woolston and Annet joined Tindal in his refutation of the prophecies and miracles; Tindal, the great apostle of the Deists described Christianity to be as old as the Creation, and identical with the natural

religion of reason, consisting of the fulfilment of our duties towards God and man; Chubb tried to prove this to be the express teaching of Christ, while Morgan applied the Deistical principle to the Old Testament, and Bolingbroke introduced it among the cultivated classes."

Though there seems much at first sight in the contentions of the Deistic school which modern English theology has sanctioned, the resemblance is wholly confined to certain conclusions in the field of biblical criticism, and regarding alleged special incidental manifestations of Himself by the Deity in the history of the world. The central theology of the Deists as a school was wholly of an eighteenth-century character. Of the modern view of the Deity as immanent, and as gradually manifested in experience, there is little to be found in them. They still conceived of the Deity as transcendent and infinitely separated from the universe in the manner of the orthodox theology current in their time. The Deity was still the old Deity of Roman origin, standing in the same relation to the world as the Roman Emperor to his Empire. The difference between them and the Church was that they denied the theory that He governed by a series of constant interventions which the orthodox called miracles. Toland and Collins, who had been influenced by Spinoza to some extent, are the only members of the school who seem at times to speak with a modern voice.

The real value of the school lies in the noble battle it fought for freedom. At a time when all utterances on theologic and philosophic subjects which did not, at least, wear the mask of agreement with orthodox ideas, were punishable by fine and imprisonment, and invariably punished by forfeiture of reputation, the most awful condemnation by the Church, and the detestation of the greater part of society, the Deists did not shrink from asserting their natural right to express their convictions. Modern theologians who have departed as widely from the old moorings as they, without sacrifice of any kind, have never given the honour due to the Deists for their work in this cause of freedom. To-day, when all examples of intolerance and repression of free utterance on the part of the Roman and Greek Churches are instantly the subjects of indignant protest from all the religious denominations in England, an act of reparation by those denominations to the memory of the "despised Deists" for the intolerant attitude of their members of two centuries ago would surely be just and fitting.

JOHN MAX ATTENBOROUGH.

ALFRED NOBEL: HIS LIFE AND WILL.

THERE will be accomplished in the month of December one of the strangest paradoxes that has ever occurred in the history of human nature. During his lifetime Mr. Alfred Nobel spent his whole career in intensifying the greatest instrument for destruction that has as yet been produced, and the wealth, which he had amassed as a result of his scientific experiments, he left by will in a worthy effort to promote the peace of the world.

The men who come after him and are to be part inheritors in his savings are forbidden to follow after the same pursuits in which Mr. Nobel engaged, but are to vie with one another to determine the surest means so as to make international warfare an anachronism and to guide the minds of men into the path of scientific research and of other peaceful attainments. This desire of Alfred Nobel is worthy of such a name, and, if we take a somewhat different view of the testator's eccentric action, we may fairly argue that his purpose as set out in this testamentary document is not so diametrically opposed to the course that he adopted during his lifetime. He recognised that men still lived in a semi-barbaric age, that peace conferences were regarded with contempt, that the uncertainties of success alone prevented nations from flying at each others' throats or from taking aggressive liberties which the unsheathed sword alone could check. It came to this:—if men must have war, let it be of such a nature that it would prove so destructive and so sharp and so horrible that the whole world would revolt against the repetition of the ghastly crime, and would with a unanimous acquiescence refer all disputes to a tribunal of peace.

Mr. Nobel could have put forward this argument quite fairly without in any way compromising his conscience as he busily applied himself to the day of his death in converting nitro-glycerine into a force of annihilation. It was not an easy task, and in view of the Nobel Institution to which we shall refer later, a brief study of his early career will show him to have been a man of splendid perseverance to the end, who overrode all difficulties that came in his way. He came of a family who were noted for their steadfastness, and who faced adversity with a fortitude that provoked admiration.

first years of the last century his father was born. Emmanuel Nobel commenced life as an architect and obtained a Government appointment in the architectural office. Like all officials he looked for a pension rather than wealth from such an appointment, but he made the most of his leisure moments in devising ideas of a more or less practical nature. On one occasion he put so much faith into a little invention that he had contrived, that he left his post in 1843 and travelled to St. Petersburg hoping to make a fortune. He was a bold man to have journeyed so far without having put his idea to the test, and either he had too much confidence in the invention or else he was ignorant of the prejudices of Government officials who in every country balk the enterprise of a civilian whenever he tries to give to them advantage over other nations.

Fortunately, Mr. Nobel was rewarded for his courage for he was employed to lay subterranean mines conical in shape which contained a mixture of ordinary tin, black powder, chlorate of potash, and sulphuric acids in a box surrounding a glass tube which held sugar crystals.

For this task he received the handsome sum of a hundred thousand roubles, but it passed through his hands as quickly as the grains of powder which he daily sampled. In a short while he became so embarrassed that he actually had to pawn the watch which the Tsar had presented to him in recognition of his work.

It was not long before the Russian Government again required his services. The Crimean War had commenced. The Ministers were in a state bordering upon panic, for those responsible at the War Office were found to have been negligent in their duties and to have casually overlooked in the hour of peace to lay down any mines in the harbours. One man alone could save them, but he had reached an age when he was content to delegate his duties to his son Robert, who was then not more than twenty-five years of age.

Robert Nobel possessed the sanguine temperament of his father, and, without hesitation, replied, "I can manage these defences for you, but you must give to me a ship." This was immediately granted to him, and, although he had never been in the Navy or any other service, he was at once promoted to the rank of an Admiral of the Fleet, an honour which could have been considered not too high a merit, since he saved Kroonstadt from attack and capture, and almost succeeded in effecting a greater distinction, the successful accomplishment of which would have given to the British public an instant cause to mourn.

He laid down about a hundred small submarine cables, and left free no more than a strait for the passage of ships which had to make for a anchorage in the harbour. These preparations had scarcely been completed when a British man-of-war hove in sight, riding straight to her doom. Before her, in the same line and quite contrary to the

strictest injunctions, danced a small Finnish ship which paid a heavy penalty for its disregard of orders, for it was blown up within the sight of the *Duke of Wellington*, and so enabled the English commander to steer away clear of the impending danger. He did not, however, leave the harbour before he had made an effort to net the cables, but the crew that was sent out to carry out the orders suffered another explosion which resulted in the loss of one life. This was danger enough for the commander who saw little chance of forcing a way into the harbour. The *Duke of Wellington* put out to sea, and Kronstadt was never again disturbed during the campaign by the too near approach of unfriendly warships. This was an undoubted advantage to Russia as her generals were able to concentrate their troops in that city of the dead, Sevastopol.

Some five years after peace had ensued between the different contesting countries in Europe Emmanuel Nobel returned with his four sons to his own native land. Fortune, as estimated in shekels, seemed as far distant from the family on the day of their return as when they had left the shores of Sweden. Robert, the eldest son, worked with his father; Ludwig, the next brother, remained behind, as he had been appointed as Inspector of Arms in Russia. In later life he was known to have the same generous disposition as Alfred, but he never attained to the same wealth which fell to the lot of Robert, who eventually went to the Caspian Sea and discovered the petroleum springs of Baku. This member of the family commenced by carrying the oil away from the springs in wooden casks, as he had not enough capital to make an outlay on tin canisters; but Alfred was by that date in a wealthy position. He gave assistance to his elder brother, and invested over ten million roubles in the concern, in return for which he claimed half the profits.

At the time, however, to which we are at this moment alluding the idea of reaching to the position of a plutocrat would have been a fancy dream; for whilst his third brother, Emil, was struggling as a student at the University, he was quite content to be a partner with his father in a milk shop. Mr. Nobel, senior, in spite of his pacific occupation, still pursued his old hobbies; and, when a Swedish Committee had been appointed to inquire into the best method for placing submarine mines in the harbours, Emmanuel Nobel saw his opportunity. He worked out an elaborate scheme of his own, confident that it would receive some practical recognition, but he was completely crestfallen when he heard nothing whatever from the experts.

It is quite possible that jealousy or prejudice checked the recommendation that he otherwise deserved. He must have been known to the Committee, for, as far back as 1848, during a residence in France, he had produced the first nitro-glycerine powder that was then known. His discovery did not pass unchallenged, for there

was an Italian claimant, and, in 1896 a scheme was devised for erecting a statue to "the Italian Subrero, the Columbus, and Alfred Nobel, the American Vespuccio."

Similar disputes did not arise in regard to later inventions. In 1862 Alfred Nobel took the position that his father had held, and discovered how to make an explosion by means of a flame, and this was the protoplasm of his most successful contribution to science. Like his father, he had to encounter various difficulties, and the small factory which he had erected in Sweden existed no longer than two years before it was blown up. The incident was a pathetic one, for it sealed the fate of Emmanuel, who shared the lot of those who perished in the explosion. Professor Cronquist, who has now attained to the highest post in connection with the inspection of explosives in Sweden, had a miraculous escape. Within two hours previous to the accident the elder Nobel had declined to accept his proffered services on the ground that the partnership of two sons was quite sufficient to direct the business.

The disaster so alarmed the public, that Alfred Nobel, who at once stepped into his father's place, was unable to obtain a lease on any land for the erection of a manufactory. He was in despair when the thought occurred to him to purchase a coal barge. This scheme, however, was more happy in the conception than in its actual accomplishment, for he had the greatest difficulty in procuring a proper anchorage. To add to the risk of his adventure he found himself in financial straits, but a M. Yvers Smitt so admired his persistency that he was willing to advance to him the necessary funds for proceeding. Alfred Nobel was well content, he valued his monopoly at a proper price, and set out for Paris in the following year (1866 A.D.). The disposal of patents to foreign companies was an idea that was little contemplated in those days, but Alfred prosecuted his intentions and launched a French company of ten million francs, the first of ten companies which he meant to form in as many different countries. As a return for his venture he was appointed Managing Director, and, within a short while after, a second factory was set up in a small Belgian village. Others, also on somewhat similar lines, were established eventually both in Sweden and in Hamburg.

It was in this last that he discovered by chance dynamite Guhr. Some of his powder had trickled out of a cask on to the damp soil and become spoilt with the infusorial earth. This was a happy accident for, as soon as the moisture had evaporated, he found that one part of this earth to three parts of nitro-glycerine not only improved its substance as an explosive, but made it safer for handling.

From this moment the business began to prosper beyond all previous contemplation. Three companies were started in America,

whilst a fourth was run in California, near Oakland, where only Chinese were employed. This economy in labour proved a disastrous expense, for there occurred an explosion so terrible that its impact was felt at a distance of forty miles. Ultimately there were as many as three factories in France, two in Belgium, and one in Sweden, with all of which Alfred Nobel was directly connected.

In England, on the other hand, he met with no success, a fact which has been attributed to our insular prejudice against embarking on any enterprise that was in any way due to foreign initiative. It was believed by many that there was an even stronger contributory cause in the person of Sir Frederick Abel, who desired to have no rival in the field of explosives. In Scotland there was not apparently the same objection to the introduction of the Nobel powder, for, just thirty years ago, the inventor started a factory at Ardrossan near Glasgow, over which he set his brother Robert as manager. Since that date he has been succeeded by M. Lundholm, who was at that time acting under him as sub-manager. This factory is now the largest in the world of its kind, and has produced no less than one million seven hundred thousand pounds worth of capital. In 1879 Alfred Nobel dissolved nitro-cellulose in nitro-glycerine which gave it a more gelatinous substance. After this he found that the more gelatinous cellulose was mixed in the nitro-glycerine the more solid it became, and the more slowly it burnt, both of which were important discoveries. On this substance he made a fuse, only to find that it was hardly satisfactory because it had not sufficient strength to act as a driving force.

The upshot of this was the advance in ballistite made from soluble nitro-glycerine, and in 1889 he gave up his right to England. Then arose the contest between cordite and ballistite. A committee was appointed, ballistite was declared to be of no account, and cordite, which was the same as the other material save that it was composed of non-soluble nitro-cellulose and nitro-glycerine, won the day. Alfred Nobel was the more sensitive to this defeat because the inventor of cordite happened to be one of the members of the committee constituted to judge between the respective merits of the explosives. He considered that there was no material difference though his patent had been made from soluble substance only. However, the English Government qualified the severity of their verdict by promising to purchase all the ballistite that the Scotch factory produced, so that the home at Ardrossan has reaped a considerable benefit therefrom.

We mentioned that the manager of this particular factory is a Swede; Alfred Nobel always chose his own countrymen for these responsible posts. Some might be disposed to regard this presumptive partiality as evidence that Nobel was a greater patriot than a fair man of business with a due regard for his employer's interests. There are no grounds whatever for such suspicions, for, just as a

German student devotes his chief attention to bacteriology, the English chemist to mineralogy, so will a Swede make the science of explosives his primary study. Undoubtedly the success of their countryman makes them ambitious in this particular direction, or perhaps they, like him, wish to hasten the termination of the trial of ordeal by war. On the other hand, it shows what a potent influence the career of Alfred Nobel has had upon the residents of Stockholm.

We now await the passing of time to prove whether or not the efforts of Alfred Nobel have avoided becoming a laudable failure. We have previously stated that the clauses in his will are no real irony upon his action during his lifetime. Like a surgeon of daring he sought to excise the cancer of war by using the most dangerous instruments since none other could be effectual.

Men, too, readily bought his death-dealing explosives; their only thought was to hold their own supremacy by the slaughter of their enemies. They wasted millions of money in this way, and Alfred Nobel hoarded it up as a rebuke to their distrust of each other and to establish the fact of Milton's most powerful line that "Peace hath her victories no less than war." At this moment professors, experts; and public officials in different countries are puzzling their minds how they can most equitably apportion the interest that has arisen from his bequest.

Five years ago Alfred Nobel died at the age of sixty-four and a bachelor, without any responsibilities save the remembrance of a few friends and one or two of his nephews to whom he left legacies of some £5000 each. One or two of his relatives were omitted, and they have decided to go to law on the matter, not because there is any dispute to deprive them of the same claim to which the more favoured nephews are gainers but rather *pro forma*. It was arranged that the will was not quite clear so that an appeal might be made to the court to obtain an exact definition. These, however, are petty items when the whole of the will is taken into account, and the sum of thirty-five million kroners or about two million pounds has been definitely set aside for investment to provide the interest of £60,000 which is to be divided quinquennially among the five different persons who have been adjudged to have most advanced the cause of peace in some particular department.

The terms upon which every candidate must qualify are extremely original and will bear a close study. In spite of his Swedish proclivities Nobel was so ready to recognise the merit of other countries that he directed that the Norwegian Storting or Parliament should adjudicate in the selection of the individual who appeared by his own efforts to have most advanced the cause of peace. This difficult honour was bestowed upon the Parliament assembled at Christiania, because it was the first official body to attempt to organise an International Peace Union. The celebrated playwright, Bjornsterne, has

been one of those deputed to settle this difficult award. This has been at some personal sacrifice to himself, because he is debarred at once from being one of the candidates for the coveted honour. He is well known as an ardent seeker of peace, though he is bellicose enough in his speeches and spares neither king nor peasant with his tongue; but it is highly interesting to learn that M. Jean de Bloch made a strenuous effort to induce the Tsar to nominate the Norwegian.

It would be not a little curious if, notwithstanding the aspirations and hopes of more prominent speakers, the committee were to convey the award to a missionary as having the most direct claim. These men, however, are a class distinct from the rest of men, and as they have become accustomed to the spiteful accusations of having indirectly hastened nations into war, they will probably have to stand aside in favour of one who has used his silver eloquence in the course of his ordinary civil life. If the committee so decide, this prize can be kept back, so that the interest can accumulate for rewards in later years. Further, the honour can rest with a society no less than with an individual, but in either case a foreign person or association has to recommend the candidates. The fighting Parliament of Hungary has thought it fit to propose the Bureau in Berne as most worthy to be the recipient. Amongst the individual names we naturally expect to find that of Tolstoi. We have already mentioned the honour that would have been conferred on Bjornsterne had he not himself formed one of the committee. M. Gobart, the Austrian author, and M. Suttner, who published the work entitled *Down with Weapons*, are also inscribed upon the list. Possibly more than one of these may share in the prize, which can be split up into two parts.

Furthermore, most of them would have a chance of winning the second bequest, which is to be awarded for the best literary thesis in favour of peace. These written contributions will be decided by the Swedish Academy at Stockholm. The author is restricted to no particular language, so that a Buddha scribe may come from the East. The judges are quite expectant that it will prove a costly task, but provision has been made for an outlay not exceeding 25 per cent. of the prize to be spent in establishing a Nobilianum, or library, in which will be collected any book that may assist the judges to secure a ready reference to such works as the aspiring essayists may allude, and to assist them more especially in the translation of such compositions that may happen to be written in a special language. Strange to say, exceptional provision will be made to possess suitable glossaries in Russian, yet no other nations in Europe cause so much unrest to their neighbours as do the inhabitants of this territory. Translators can be engaged if it is found necessary, but their intrusion is likely to mar the success of the candidate if any account is taken of style. On the other hand

while the expression of thought may possess a charm of its own, the judges (all of whom, in this instance, must be Swedish) would be exceeding their proper province of criticism if they gave credit for the style rather than the matter contained in the plea for peace. For this reason the force of an argument can be more efficiently tested, if it is equally cogent, in a language other than that in which it was written.

Whatever be the result of this contest for the bay crown of Peace there is almost certain to arise some difference of opinion, for, when the time for selection is ripe, nations will acclaim the merits of their own countrymen, however much they may have ignored them in the past, and they will set the weight of their feeling against the verdict of a few experts. This would be but human. On the other hand, we fail to see what better system could have been devised, for the utmost care has been taken to appoint competent judges. Chief of them sits no less a personage than the Professor of Literature at Gothenburg, who receives 6000 kroners a year, a sum not too great considering the responsibilities that devolve upon him. Moreover, he will have no light task if it falls to his lot to select the books to be placed on the shelves of the Nobel Pantheon.

There is less interest in the other three awards as regards presenting an explanation of their purpose. They will be devoted to some special branch in science. It may be said that, while the judges in the first two instances choose a candidate who has done his best to proclaim the virtues of mercy and amity from the house-tops, in the last three instances the prizes will go to those who have retired to and laboured the most industriously in their secluded laboratories. Eighteen members from the Svenska Academy of Science at Stockholm will be called upon to nominate the doyens in physics, in medicine, and in chemistry.

Professor Koch might win the purse of honour if he could only satisfactorily prove his recent attack against animal tuberculosis, but there might be some who would be disposed to say that he had only secured a negative triumph in that so far from benefiting the world as a new *Æsculapius*, he had only succeeded in banishing an erroneous supposition.

Every candidate who competed in the hope that some new invention of his would achieve his ambition, would be called upon to take his patent to Stockholm for inspection, but in the event of another's boast being more triumphant he would be allowed his travelling expenses.*

It can be well understood that a considerable amount of attention must have been given to investing Alfred Nobel's vast wealth, for others before and after him have had larger fortunes, and died in comparative penury. Many, however, will be astonished to learn that the inventor left the care of his money to a single lady resident

at Stockholm, who thus proved by her ability that ladies can occasionally become good financiers, though we do not on that account advise a nation to entrust to them the public exchequer.

M. Nobel's executor, is M. Sohlman, who has never acquired any previous knowledge of book-keeping, and who is still some years short of thirty. But he attained the special confidence of M. Nobel, because "he is a man who has never asked anything of me." This last remark might be misconstrued, for the millionaire was no miser, though none could guess what he spent on charities, for all his gifts were made without ostentation and with as much secrecy as possible. This generosity extended to his own workmen, whose numbers were not less than a hundred thousand. None of them went on strike in spite of their numerical strength, because he insisted on paying them well, so he secured among them the sobriquet of "Nobel by name, and noble in deed."

Quite apart from his inexperience M. Sohlman had the additional difficulty of being engaged on military service at the time when he was called upon to carry out his executive duties. It was, therefore, a relief to him to feel that he had as his colleague the manager of the factory at Bergen, who was to receive a sum of £500, but even he found it more profitable to hand over his responsibilities to a lawyer, M. Santesson, of Stockholm. Their duties, however, will be less arduous than they might have been, for, distinct from the complications that will arise in connection with the various legacies, instructions have been given to the executor to invest the whole of the two millions of pounds in Government stocks, which will undoubtedly prove an admitted benefit to the country, but it will also once and for all dissociate the name of Alfred Nobel from the business which he formed, at least in so far as finance is concerned. Others, however, will willingly accept the securities and the responsibilities, for the firm has become so sound that it is not likely to fail from want of capital. Indeed, its end can only result when an international peace has been established, and the fruit of Alfred Nobel's final efforts shall have become an accomplished fact.

A. EDMUND SPENDER.

THE NEW NOVEL BY ANTHONY HOPE.

A FAMOUS pianist of the present day once said to some one who remarked that now his reputation was made he need not work so hard: "On the contrary, I must work harder, to maintain it." One would commend the wisdom of this view to Mr. Anthony Hope, who has lived so long in fanciful regions, with charming, fairy-tale kings and queens and princesses, that his pen has got out of the way of depicting modern English life, and his knowledge of English law become, certainly, a little obscure. "The best book he has written!" cried an enthusiast, flinging *Tristram of Blent* down, the last page read, "and—look at the title!" Yes, titles are all very well in their way; one naturally expects a title. A good one does carry a book along splendidly, but the title is not everything; there should be an equally absorbing amount of interest between the covers. In the case of Mrs. Humphrey Ward's *Helbeck of Bannisdale*, there was a good title, leading to an intellectual treat, and exquisite character drawing. The character drawing in *Tristram* is only shadowy, the book is more than anything an outline of a chain of events rather singular in themselves, though probably not so uncommon in reality as might be supposed. In this latest result of Mr. Anthony Hope's inspiration the promise of the title leads to disappointment, disillusion, all the more vexatious because of the eager anticipation of something out of the common it led one's mind to form. A somewhat hazy recollection comes to me of having heard the author coupled with authority on law. This recollection may have to crumble away as the baseless fabric of an empty dream, certainly the new book refutes the imputation, for the entire fabric of *Tristram of Blent* crumbles away, reduced to absolute nothingness, on a point of law which, in its technical severity, yet simplicity, ruthlessly and ignominiously demolishes the entire structure of the "episode in the story of an ancient house," and at the end of the rather unconvincing trials, heroic self-sacrifice, &c., of Harry Tristram, leaves him *Tristram of Blent* in his own right still, without the fraud perpetrated by Madame la Comtesse d'Albreville, though he and his author do not, apparently, know it. This might not be so noticeable if Mr. Anthony Hope were not at such pains

Tristram of Blent. By Anthony Hope. London: John Murray.

throughout the book to insist on the strict letter of the law. At the conclusion of what but for this error would have been an extremely fine scene and *dénouement* Cecily Gainsborough asks:

“‘And you? And you?’

‘I? I’m—Harry.’

‘Harry? Harry? Harry what?’

He smiled as he looked at her; as his eyes met hers he smiled.

‘Harry what? Harry Nothing,’ he said, ‘Harry Nothing at all.’”

In which he displayed his ignorance, for he ought to have known that whatever his personal feelings on the subject may have been—as expressed by him at nearly the end of the book—his name, nevertheless, *in law* (the legality of his mother's second marriage being not proven), was Harry Edge, son of Sir Randolph Edge, Bart., the first husband, *the husband* (presumably) of Lady Tristram of Blent when he was born. This rash young man should have realised that his personal likes and dislikes could not upset the law. Of course, his position was made unassailable, eventually, by the introduction of Madame la Comtesse and her manœuvre, but the defect of the book is that in a whole of 408 pages, 334 of these are based on the false hypothesis that Tristram was in strict point of law illegitimate, and cut off from the heirs general in the line of descent without any legal intervention whatsoever. Since when has the offspring of a married woman been pronounced—in law, mind—illegitimate? Only when the husband has contested the birth, and disclaimed the paternity. Even then it is extremely difficult to succeed in establishing a disclaimer. It is really like an *ingénu* that our author puts the position. Sir Randolph Edge is supposed to have died. His supposed widow is immediately married to another man. But Sir Randolph

“died, in fact, on the 24th, as his wife reckoned time, and her wedding to Captain F. on the 23rd was an idle and useless form. When the discovery was made the boy was born—and born out of lawful wedlock.”

Lawful fiddlesticks! Had Lady Edge, then, been divorced? When the boy was born he was born *in* lawful wedlock, and his position in law became the posthumous son of Sir Randolph Edge. *Il n'y a rien au monde plus incontestable que ça!* He was in law Lady Tristram's (Lady Edge she was then) rightful son, her first marriage not having been dissolved by any legal process. Moreover, we cannot even be sure that, morally as well as legally, Harry Tristram was not Sir Randolph's son, since we are carefully told that after Sir Randolph went off alone “the lady was not long left in solitude,” and perhaps—it is not incompatible with the author's dates and incomprehensible omission of dates—the direct line of descent was already provided for, unknown even to the lady herself. Such curious phenomena has been known. This is the pretty

muddle we are confronted with in *Tristram of Blent*, and I do not see that Mr. Anthony Hope can be complimented on his singular achievement.

Of Harry Tristram himself one can speak with but little patience, and less admiration. Of all unfeeling, unendurable prigs of literary creation he may easily win the laurel wreath for his "peaked" brow, or, in the vulgar parlance of a multitude as brusque and *sans-gêne* as himself, take the particular comestible manufactured by a firm we all know. On his wedding-day, in trying to atone for his deception, he behaves with an unceremoniousness almost amounting to brutality, that very few brides would pardon. The "Tristram way," however. He is exceedingly fond of asking a lady why she has "lied," or of announcing that he has "lied," or somebody has "lied," or somebody will "lie." Here is a specimen of his filial regard:

"Bob, come to a standstill, was taking the opportunity of lighting his pipe. This done, he looked up at the house and back to Harry rather timidly.

'Lady Tristram----?' he began.

'My mother has been dead something above an hour,' said Harry."

After this serene statement they had a little talk, and then:

"'As soon as I begin to have people here I hope you'll come often,' said Harry cordially. 'Naturally we shall be a *little more lively* than we've been able to be of late, and I shall hope to see all my friends.'"

His mother dead something above an hour! . . . A very beautiful woman in the prime of life!

The book considered only for style, not plot, nor delineation of character, has innumerable artistic defects, as well as on page 169 absolutely bad grammar. And what does this mean on page 105?

"The Man in Possession was strong. The perils that had seemed so threatening were passing away. Mina was devoted; Neeld would be silent——"

It is vastly puzzling to make out who is supposed to be indulging in these reflections. If Major Duplay, as one might assume, he was totally ignorant of any knowledge on Neeld's part that it might be desirable to suppress. If the Man in Possession was soliloquising, he also was ignorant of Neeld; indeed, we are placidly told a few pages further on that "He knew nothing of Neeld, and could not think of that quiet old gentlemen as a possible menace to his secret." *Viola!* So who is it presuming that "Neeld would be silent"? Really, Mr. Anthony Hope, you treat your readers as children!

As Harry will have nothing of his legal name of Edge there is a great fuss about bestowing one on him, which has the effect of still further extending the ludicrous maze into which we are led. If we accept, for the sake of argument, that he was not Sir Randolph's

son, and that Lady Edge had forfeited the right to call herself Sir R.'s wife, then the latter, if she had not become the wife of Captain F. when her son was born, conferred—always by law—her maiden name of Tristram on that impossible infant. Yet a royal licence is twice needed to tag the name on to him. We are told that when he was nine years old "the name of Tristram was assumed by royal licence." Again is that royal convenience industriously trotted out at the age of twenty-two, when we find "he had just taken steps to obtain a royal licence to bear the name." One naturally wonders why royal licences are bestowed with such bounteous liberality, and what the maximum number of times is, in one family.

Here and there in the book one meets with refreshing bits of the sparkle of the original Anthony Hope—when his wit and humour will spontaneously pop in—but these welcome bits are few and far between. When a writer with a high reputation offers a new product of his talent to an admiring, expectant public, that exacting ogre naturally looks for a tolerably fair realisation of its expectations, if not in downright originality of plot and thought, at least in workmanship and polish. The latter merits are conspicuously absent from *Tristram of Blent*. So far from agreeing with my enthusiast that it is the best book Mr. Anthony Hope has written, I find it the very worst of his productions I have read, and I could wish in my heart that before launching it on the sea of posterity with his name attached, he had secured the collaboration of an editor as penetrating and discreet as his own Mr. Jenkinson Neeld.

EVELYN GÉRARD.

EDWARD CARPENTER:

THE WALT WHITMAN OF ENGLAND.

WHEN a great writer and original thinker stamps his individuality on the age in which he lives, it is but natural that, as time rolls on, disciples great and small should gather themselves together under his standard. So has it been with Walt Whitman, America's fearless bard of democracy. Greatest of all those followers is Edward Carpenter, the author of that marvellous and mystic work, *Towards Democracy*. Indeed there have not been wanting those who would fain place him on an even higher pedestal than the "good grey poet" of the west himself. Count Tolstoi, whilst declaring that he "could make nothing of Walt Whitman," praises very highly the work of his English disciple. Certain it is that of that peculiar school which Whitman has called into being, Carpenter is now the foremost living exponent. He has not his master's lusty and vigorous style—as free from the musty canons of the art critic as the rainbow's changing form or the dancing, glistening sunbeam—but still he has inherited a goodly share of his philosophy of life and his manner of presenting it. Not that Carpenter is by any means an imitator. He is indeed a striking and original thinker, who has seemingly steeped himself thoroughly in the *Leaves of Grass* and then given forth his own conception of life and the boundless universe, blended with the distilled fragrance of Whitman's more masculine and virile song. He is no more an imitator of Whitman (as the word imitator is usually understood) than William Morris is of Keats and Chaucer or Lord Tennyson is of Byron and Longfellow.

Unlike Walt Whitman, Edward Carpenter was bred in the lap of learning, studied at Cambridge, sat at the feet of mighty philosophers and far-famed statesmen, became University lecturer, and yet, like Solomon of olden time, was prompted to exclaim, "All, all is vanity." Some of the poems which he published in this, his early life, are pleasant reading enough, but they leave on the reader no distinctive imprint of the writer's own personality.

Already, however, the conviction had sprung up within him that he had an important message to deliver to the age in which he lived. He fled from Cambridge, threw up his lecturing engage-

ments, and retired to the solitude of an old friend's farm at Bradney, in the neighbourhood of Sheffield. Even prior to this, however, his over-mastering love of Nature had begun to manifest itself, for in the intervals of his University life he devoted himself with rare vigour and enthusiasm to the open-air life of a farm-labourer. When once he had all things in readiness for the commencement of his great work, *Towards Democracy*, his life under the open skies was almost continuous. "I knocked together a sort of wooden sentinel-box in the garden, and there, or in the fields and woods, all that spring and summer, and on through the winter, by day and sometimes by night, in sunlight or in rain, I wrote *Towards Democracy*, or, at any rate, the first and longer poem that goes by that name." Fit disciple this, of him who wrote, *From Noon to Slurry Night*, and *The Song of the Open Road*.

"I think heroic deeds were all conceived in the open air and all free poems also.

Now I see the secret of the making of the best poems,
It is to grow in the open air and to eat and sleep with the earth."

'Twas thus in the open air that this "free poem" of Edward Carpenter's was conceived and crystalised into a living, spiritual force that should penetrate throughout the world. Whilst writing the poem, he says that, when indoors, he found it impossible to conjure up those thoughts and fancies which in the open air freely clothed themselves with the warm flesh and blood of language. Neither mood nor meaning came to him when cribbed, cabin'd and confined by walls of brick and mortar. Under the inspiration of the clouds, the sky, sunlight and moonlight was *Towards Democracy* written.

It is impossible to fully convey the meaning of this poem by any series of quotations, howsoever skilfully chosen. Not one line or one paragraph even contains the keynote to his message. Extracts indeed tend rather to obscure the author's meaning by limiting the universality of its application. High as the heavens, boundless as the universe is the scope of *Towards Democracy*. Like an unfettered human soul, it rises from summit to summit, explores the abysmal depths of life "where foaming hell grows hoarse with gusty thunder," fathoms the mysteries of time and space, and yet forgets not the shivering street-beggar asking for an alms, nor the sweated tailoress, nor the builders skilfully laying stone on stone and pier on pier. Nought in the universe is too great or too small for that unfettered human soul—nay, in its kingdom there is neither great nor small, for there the spirit of Nature, of freedom and equality (and are not these three one?) reigns supreme.

Towards Democracy consists of one long poem of seventy stanzas and a hundred or more shorter pieces, all, however, blended

together by the same spirit of fearless seeking after truth, and, seemingly, all the outcome of one mighty inspiration. Throughout the work the author speaks as the embodiment of this unfettered soul "whose body is cast away," and in that capacity interprets anew the "meaning of the word democracy" in its loftiest and grandest significance. "These things, I, writing, translate for you; I wipe a mirror and place it in your hands." To Carpenter, democracy represents the inward expression of progressive life as well as its outward development.

"Of that which exists in the soul, political freedom and institutions of equality are but the shadows necessarily thrown; and democracy in states and constitutions but the shadow of that which first expresses itself in the glance of the eye or the appearance of the skin."

Despite the almost infinite variety of its lights and shadows, one central theme soon reveals itself to the sympathetic reader. Whether he speaks of God and religion, of the meaning of life and death, of freedom and democracy or of slavery and servitude he is ever dreaming the dream of "the soul's slow disentanglement." This phrase to him sums up the meaning of the word democracy. The story of the travail of the soul of man from bondage to freedom is the story of this poet's book. He follows the flight of humankind through many lands and through many ages, even unto that dim and misty futurity when man has gained complete mastery over himself. 'Tis thus that he interprets the meaning of man's incessant struggle with Nature and unfolds the spiritual significance of the latter-day doctrine of evolution or as he terms it "exfoliation"—the growth and unfolding of the human flower.

"Ages and ages back,
Out of the long grass with infinite pain raising itself into the
upright position,
A creature—fore-runner of man—with swift eyes glanced around.

So to-day once more,
With pain and suffering—driven by whatever instinct—who can
tell?

Out of the great jungle of custom and supposed necessity, into a
new and wonderful life, to new and wonderful knowledge,
Surpassing words, surpassing all past experience—the Man, the
meaning of it all,
Uproars himself again."

Far back through the ages he sees the germ of the giant Democracy. With chaste fancy and beautiful imagery he likens it to a mighty river, that rises in the distant past when the world was young and vigorous, and whose tributaries drain all the vast domains of time and all the known and unknown world.

"Inevitable in time for man and all creation is the realisation: the husks, one behind another, keep shelling and peeling off."

"Rama crosses to Ceylon by the giant stepping-stones; and the Ganges floats with the flowers and sacred lamps of the pilgrims; Diotima teaches Socrates divine lore; Benedict plunges his midnight lust in nettles and briars; and Bruno stands prevaricating, yet obstinate, before his judges.

"The midnight jackals scream round the village; and the feigned cry of the doe is heard as she crosses the track of the hunter pursuing her young; the chaffinch sits close in her perfect nest, and the shining, leaping waters of the streams run on and on.

"The great stream of history runs on.

"Over the curve of the misty horizon, out of the dim past (do you not see it?), over the plains of China and the burning plains of India, by the tombs of Egypt and through the gardens beneath the white tower of Belus, and under the shadow of the great rock of Athens, the great stream descends;

"Soft, slow, broad-bosomed mother stream—where the Ark floats, and Isis in her moon-shaped boat sails on with the corpse of Osiris, and the child-god out of the water rises seated on a lotus-flower, and Brahma, two-sexed, dwells amid the groves, and the maidens weep for Adonis."

From those early teachers, from all the mighty nations of bygone days and from Nature's infinite book of secrecy, democracy, he tells us, has drawn its power and inspiration. Democracy, he insists, is not the mere outward machinery of state and commune which sometimes passes by that name, but rather the inward spirit and hidden manifestations of which these are but the passing shadows. From those pictures of the past he turns with moistened eyes to modern Merrie England. But alas! much of the merriment has fled since the time when Robin Hood and Friar Tuck presided o'er her springtide revelries. Everywhere he sees that modern infidelity has taken the form of "belief in externals." Place and power, Sir Gorgius Midas and Mrs. Grundy—these are the gods and goddesses of latter-day England. With a turgid vehemence worthy of either Walt Whitman or Thomas Carlyle he attacks the hydra-headed demon-god with truly refreshing candour. Not Mrs. Grundy and her cast-iron world of custom and caprice does he sigh for, but a full, free life under the open skies. Not wealth and power does he desiderate, but manly dignity allied to a life of honest work by free and honest men. Throughout all life he reads the eternal lesson that work and change are the endless laws of Nature. The waves' incessant roll but purifies the great, mysterious ocean that cradles our mother earth; the rush and roar of labour in its myriad avocations vivifies and beautifies the human form; the endless changes in our social system lend health and vitality to our racial life. Throughout all Nature stagnation breeds putrefaction, disease, debility, and death. To him the two purifying forces in life are labour and democracy, accompanied by a return to all the leisurely laws of Nature. Labour, free and unfettered for the individual; democracy coming like a mighty river to purify our social life—such is the ideal of *Towards Democracy*, whilst anon, in the midst of it all, says our author—

"I hear grown, bearded men shouting in the woods for joy, shouting, singing with the birds; I hear the ringing chorus over all the world of the return to Joy."

To Edward Carpenter the return to a closer communion with Nature is the first great step towards human happiness. Alike in his prose and verse he has proclaimed that conviction from the housetops. In a masterly prose treatise¹ he traces, with graphic pen, man's departure from the garden of Nature; forcibly and at times satirically sets forth the hollow artificiality of modern life, and points to us the way back to the Paradise of Nature. Aadfigel with flaming sword keeps watch and ward o'er the entrance, but his armour is not invulnerable. The angel is a weak and erring mortal, and the flaming sword which he wields so dexterously is the lust of power and riches. Back to the perennial simplicity of Nature is Carpenter's resounding summons:

"I heard a voice say unto me:

Now since thou art neither beautiful nor witty, it is in vain that thou hangest about the doors of the admired palaces:

For thou wilt not gain admission—thou!

But here outside is a plot of waste ground, where canst build thee a little cabin—all thine own;

And since it is close by the common road and there is no fence about it,

Many a weary traveller, parched with the heat of the day, shall turn in unto thee for a cup of cold water:

And that shall suffice for thy life."

Or again:

"Come up into the fragrant woods and walk with me.

The voices of the trees and the silent growing grass and waving ferns ascend;

Beyond the birth and death veil of the seasons, they ascend and are born again;

The voices of human joy and misery, the hidden cry of the heart—they too ascend into new perpetual birth.

All is interpreted anew:

In man the cataracts descend, and the winds blow, and autumn reddens and ripens;

And in the woods a spirit walks, which is not wholly of the woods,

But which looks out over the wide earth and draws to itself all men with deep unearthly love:

Come, walk with me:"

Refreshing, even as the woods and skies and storms are, is Carpenter's intense and burning love of Nature. Spurning with light foot the populations of to-day, self-doomed to "pluck oakum for ever from the strands of real life," he exclaims:

"Oh, for a breath of the sea and the great mountains!

A bronzed hardy live man walking his way through it all;

¹ *Civilisation: Its Cause and Cure.*

Thousands of men companioning the waves and the storms,
splendid in health, naked-breasted, catching the lion with
their hands;

A thousand women, swift-footed and free—owners of themselves,
forgetful of themselves in all their actions—full of joy and
laughter and action;

Garbed not so differently from the men, joining with them in
their games and sports, sharing also their labours;

Free to hold their own, to grant or withhold their love, the same
as the men;

Strong, well equipped in muscle and skill—clear of all finesse and
affectation—

(The men, too, clear of much brutality and conceit)—

Comrades together, equal in intelligence and adventure,

Trusting without concealment, loving without shame, but with
discrimination and continence towards a perfect passion."

From the foregoing it will be seen that on the "Woman Question," which to-day occupies so prominent a place in the charter of reformers of social and political life, Edward Carpenter speaks with no hesitating voice. Frank and fearless are his words. Alike in his prose¹ and in his verse, he surveys with sympathetic mind those vital problems that affect the majority of womankind. One poem on this theme I shall take the liberty of quoting in its entirety, as showing alike his marvellous powers as word-painter, his skilful use of chaste and beautiful imagery, as well as his deep, intuitive insight into the heart of a woman and a mother.

"THE MOTHER TO HER DAUGHTER.

"Beautiful child, that launchest out on the great sea of life,
Soon I, thy mother, must leave thee; soon the dark shalt close
me in and leave thee in the bright sunshine.

And thy lovers shall come and make love to thee, they shalt lay
their fortunes at thy feet; and their strength and the glory
of their manhood;

They shall desire thee, for thou art beautiful as the silver sickle
moon, arising in heaven before the dawn.

Yet when they come, forget me not, O my child; be not deceived
by their words;

For none ever again shall love thee as I love thee, none ever
again shall know as I know thy hidden thoughts—none shall
read the light that plays upon thy face as I can read it.

These shall love thee for themselves: they shall seek thee in order
to possess thee; but I have given all that I have to thee.

All the years that we have been together since thou first pressed
thy tiny palm upon my breast to look into my face until
now;

I have given myself to thee.

Before thy feet, or ever thou couldst walk, my love has walked,
my thoughts have circled thee, my desire has made thee
very beautiful.

¹ In a recent volume, entitled *Love's Coming of Age*, he discusses with rare freedom and acumen, the various social, ethical and economical problems that have grown up around the world-wide woman question. The subjects discussed are "Woman; her place in Society; Marriage; Sex-love, &c.," each chapter forming a permanent contribution to the subject of which it treats.

If I might pray, I pray that when thou hast known the love of
man,

Thou, too, mayst become a mother, and so, even through travail
and suffering, mayst know the greater love.

Then far away down the years thou shalt remember me—

As when one ascends a mountain, the opposite mountain lifts
itself higher and higher, so, as thou goest farther from me, I
will grow upon thee clearer and closer even than now."

In the lines quoted from time to time, I am fully conscious that I have not presented Carpenter at his highest standard. Yet, what impassioned symphony of Beethoven, or what glorious sonata would but suffer by the display of one or two isolated chords of music—nay, would not even Shelley's stirring "O weep for Adonais, he is dead," or Whitman's own sublime death-song, lose half their charm and nearly all their power by even the most skilful mutilation? To be fully appreciated they must be sympathetically rendered from the first grand outburst even to the last triumphant chorus. Knowing this, we have quoted but little from Carpenter's greatest poem *Towards Democracy*, but have rather contented ourselves with choice specimens culled from those of his lesser songs which are animated by a kindred spirit. In it, as we have seen, he, Walt Whitman like, reincarnates himself in every form of life and Nature—the waving ferns and the spirit of the trees, the slave and freeman, the realist and idealist, and thus inspired sends forth his message to the world.

Surveying his written work with critical eyes one cannot help but see the wide variety of sources from which the poet has drawn his strength. A poet of Nature and democracy, he is above all things. The outer world of man, the changing seasons, and the ever-rolling years have deeply left their imprint on a mind of much strength, originality, and refinement. But these were not all. From the ancient theosophists, from the great, sad Buddah, from "the savage, eternal peaks, the solitary signals—Walt Whitman and Jesus of Nazareth," he has gathered the wisdom of life. Thus has he been taught to proclaim some neglected truths of modern life: that modern science is lopsided and haphazard in its methods; that we have surmounted the hills of purely speculative knowledge and stumbled amongst the mole-hills of real life; that our science has been materialistic where it might well have spiritual-istic; that it is from within rather than from without that all true progress must come—in short, that "exfoliation" rather than "evolution" is the keynote of all progressive life.

Concerning the problems of life and death, his mind is at perfect peace:

"Death shall change as the light in the morning changes,
Death shall change as the light twixt moonset and dawn."

No pessimist this; he knows that evil was not made to last, that

man, the prodigal son of Nature, shall yet return repentant to his mother's breast.

What place as a poet posterity shall award to Edward Carpenter it were indeed difficult to determine. From superficial and thoughtless observers two criticisms may naturally be expected: First, that he is but a clever imitator of Walt Whitman; and second, perhaps, that like his master his "barbaric yawp" is a jumble of meaningless jargon. To the latter we have now no word to say. To many intelligent thinking people, Carlyle at his loftiest and his best is but as a sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. To the sage of Chelsea himself Shelley spoke, but in a "hysterical screech." To Swinburne Lord Byron is amongst the most worthless of all our modern bards. When therefore a man of great original genius breaks the bonds of conventional verse and leaves the tags of rhyme behind him, we may naturally expect that the host of his detractors will be proportionally greater. (Once we remember hearing a supercilious critic, after listening to a rendering of Whitman verse, remark disparagingly and in all seriousness, "It isn't at all like the poems I admired in my younger days—for example like :

' Mary had a little lamb,
Its fleece was white as snow,' &c.

"That's what I call poetry!")

Nevertheless, if as we believe, and as a modern critic (himself a poet of no mean order) has said: the essence of all poetry and philosophy is communion with the "infinite and the eternal"—then indeed Walt Whitman and Edward Carpenter must be numbered amongst the veriest masters of the art of poesy.

To those, on the other hand, who may be inclined to say that we have in Carpenter but a docile pupil of Whitman, some further answer must be given. Follower, disciple, indeed he is, but no slavish one. Perhaps the fullest and truest answer can best be given in our author's own words:

"I read and re-read *Leaves of Grass* continuously for ten years. . . . It 'filtered and fibred' my blood, but I do not think I ever tried to imitate it or its style. Against the inevitable drift out of the more classic forms of verse into a looser and freer rhythm I fairly fought, contesting the ground inch by inch during a period of seven years, till in 1881 I was finally compelled into the form of *Towards Democracy*. I did not adopt it because it was an approximation to the form of *Leaves of Grass*. Whatever resemblance there may be between the rhythm, style, thoughts, construction, &c., of the two books must, I think, be set down to a deeper similarity of emotional atmosphere and intention of the two authors—even though that similarity may have sprung, and no doubt largely did spring, out of the personal influence of one upon the other."

With this modest pronouncement the student of literature will be inclined to cordially agree. There are, however, some respects in

which Carpenter rises superior to Walt Whitman himself. True, he has never mounted up to the lofty grandeur attained by the former in *President Lincoln's Funeral Hymn*, nor to the breadth and vigour and boundless freedom of the *Song of the Open Road*. But, in the sweetness of his music, in his free and throbbing melody, he stands pre-eminently first. The music of his song—free as the larks—falls upon us in clear and joyous notes. (“I am the poet of hitherto unuttered joy.”) He chooses his language with finer discernment than does the “good grey poet” who sings “the modern man.” The innate harmony of his verse is ineffably sweet. Dreaming too, whilst Whitman fronts the noonday glare of life, his inspiration is gentler and more soothing than the vigorous verse of *Leaves of Grass*. As with the seers of olden time, his vision of the truth has cast forth all doubt from his mind, and his manly, ringing words “Have faith” beget in the hearts of all his readers that complacent and confident spirit which removes the mountains of despair and darkness and casts them for ever into oblivion’s sea.

Assuredly, those two, Walt Whitman and Edward Carpenter, shall yet stand side by side in the world’s great arena of criticism, as two of our latest bards who have proved themselves worthy of the widest acceptance—Whitman, a perennial fount of life and lordly vigour,—Carpenter, a little lower down, in the ranks of modern teachers, yet filling faithfully and well his own peculiar niche in the great temple of Fame.

WILLIAM DIACK.

CONDITIONAL IMMORTALITY :

A MIS-READ RECORD.

IN his account of Britain Caesar reports the existence of a priesthood bearing the name of Druids. Regarding this order he writes that "it is a principal doctrine of theirs that the soul of man does not perish, but passes, after death, from one body to another. This they esteem the best incitement to courage, as banishing fear of death. They also discourse and reason much concerning the stars and their motions, the constitution of nature, and the power and authority of the immortal gods; which matters they impart to their pupils, who learn by heart a vast number of verses, for it is not held lawful to commit their tenets to writing." (*De Bello Gallico*, vi. 14.)

The above description will also serve as typical, in degree, of primitive religions generally. Thus in each religious system are found traces of natural science and observation underlying or mingled with the asserted supernatural "revelation." It seems, indeed, to have been of the normal tactics of hierarchy or priestcraft to lie in wait for and appropriate such knowledge as was attained by the patient and unbiassed observer of natural phenomena; to anathematise and suppress his facts if contrary to existent doctrines and therefore dangerous to priestly prosperity, or to accept them in so far as they could profitably be adduced or adapted to support the declared dogmas of "the power and authority of the immortal gods." It by no means follows that the philosophic or scientific items in any given religion were the outcome of local or contemporary observers only; the doctrines, either natural or supernatural, might be wholly traditional, or annexed from more than one extraneous source. While, therefore, the Druids may have owed the idea of metempsychosis to Greek philosophy, their inklings of astronomic science point back to a yet earlier origin. In sundry religions, moreover, may be traced the widest licence of honest or dishonest interpretation in manipulating the teachings themselves, whether to suit the varying mental attitude of disciples, or to serve ulterior purposes of the priests. And to even the most conscientious interpreter between two races an inevitable element of error exists, proportionate to the disparity in idiom and spirit of the languages.

themselves, and the difficulty of rendering into another tongue words capable only of expressing an alien phase of thought or a different grade of human progress.

The English-speaking peoples at large suffer from a double share of the foregoing eventualities in accepting the usual English versions of the Hebrew scriptures; both from inaccurate rendering of the Hebrew into a modern tongue,¹ and yet more in that the Hebrew text itself has been largely an imperfect reproduction from ulterior sources. In this latter instance, seeing that even under the best auspices *traduttore è traditore*, a more than ordinary proportion of such treachery would be inevitable in the attempt to adjust the scientific and philosophic records of a wider culture to a crude and inefficient Semitic dialect wherein, as the proficient Renan points out, "abstract ideas can be expressed only with the greatest difficulty, and there is a complete absence of the scientific instinct." One ill result of the latter defect was that the scriptural writers condemned and forbade any study of the stars as "idolatrous," and they ignorantly threw contempt on astronomical observation in other nations. The source of this religious prohibition of science by the Hebrews was apparently that "in their eyes the investigation of causes was either a vain occupation (Ecclesiastes i.-iii.); or impiety and a usurpation of the rights of God (Job xxxviii.-xli.)—as ignoring his power, by reducing the government of the universe to a play of forces which are susceptible of being calculated."²

But in addition to such earlier involuntary errors, the later Talmudic rabbis and scribes were continually interested in "amending" the script to accord with their narrowing views of orthodoxy, or growing perceptions of seemliness. Their arrogated option of correction covered a wide ground, ranging from simple euphemisms to vital alterations of the written text; and to evade censorious observation these amendments were directed to be carried out inconspicuously. Levita speaks of the ritual *law* by which the rabbis enforced the propriety of modifying certain words, when transcribing from old copies, but "in such a manner that the new ones should not offend the ears of the faithful." Ginsburg also details that "the alterations were to be made with as little departure

¹ There was but a very superficial knowledge of Hebrew among the compilers of the English "authorised version" (King James's): and thus with a facile acceptance of *ignotum pro magifico*, and by using the grand diction of England's Augustan age, they dressed the crude Hebrew tongue in a glory not its own, as Fitzgerald did with Omar Khayyam. It is the fulness and majesty of language of the paraphrase that has led to a most erroneous English idea of the richness of the Hebrew thought and vernacular. A reader who turns to the stricter renderings in the Greek or Latin, or any modern language but English, may gauge somewhat of the actual sterility which was embellished by the Jacobean clerics. In the recent "Revised Version" no serious rectification of the conventional renderings is to be expected (or found), since its compilers were bound by the contract of their remuneration: 1. "To introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness" (to what?). 2. "To limit, as far as possible, the expression of such alterations to the language of the Authorised and earlier English Versions."

² Renan: *The Book of Job*, preface.

from the text as possible; they consisted in transposing letters, in dropping one or more, or in substituting one for another, which would give a different meaning."

The general scope of these ordained mutilations is briefly summarised from the various authorities by Dr. Inman, as follows:

"The sacred scriptures, as they were first known to the Talmudists, contained matter which was offensive (1) from its apparent obscenity or coarseness; (2) from its being heterodox. Those things that were considered opposed to orthodoxy were (a) those which seemed to assert the plurality of God; (b) those which attributed to the god of any other nation a name or a power similar to that possessed by the God of the Jews; (c) those which were anthropomorphic; (d) those which attributed to God anything which was deemed erroneous; (e) those in which the sacred name was used in short cognominal sentences, or stood for the name of a man; (f) those which attributed to the patriarchs anything derogatory to the saintly character; (g) those which were prejudicial to the fair fame of the Holy nation; (h) those which attributed to men the functions of God; (i) those which spoke leniently of the nations whom the Jews had been taught to hate; (j) and to introduce into the text certain legal changes." (*Ancient Faiths*, vol. i. p. 186.)

In all these matters was modification enjoined and practised. The Talmudists adopted also a yet further procedure in factitiously assigning widely different meanings to one and the same word, declaring that it was impossible to understand rightly the Scripture except with these their glosses; and to such a pitch was the system carried that Schürer has to report:

"Later Judaism discovered that there is a fourfold meaning of Scripture, which is indicated by the word *pardes* (paradise), viz., (1) *peskut*, the simple or literal meaning; (2) *remes* (suggestion), the meaning arbitrarily imported into it; (3) *derush* (investigation), the meaning deduced by investigation; (4) *sod* (mystery), the theosophic meaning."¹ (*History of the Jewish People*, II. i. 348.)

In face of the manifold rabbinic injunctions and alterations it is futile to rely on "accuracy" in any critical passage of Scripture, even in the copying from an earlier to a later Hebrew text. Comparison of the full amount of change effected has been made impossible by the disappearance of the early Hebrew scripts; the oldest existent copy—the Codex Petropolitanus, or St. Petersburg MS.—dating back only to 916 A.D.! Considering the literally "punctilious" care assumedly enforced on the Hebrew transcribers and custodians, it is scarcely possible to credit the loss of *all* the

¹ In the existent text, however, there remain passages such as the first and following verses of the twelfth chapter of Ecclesiastes, which—without any recourse to fantastic theories—present two entirely different, yet equally etymological significations; one of the morality that is shown in the English version, and the other of a nature to be paralleled only in the lucubrations of Martial. Considering the debatable character of the book of Ecclesiastes generally, it is impossible to assume its lengthy and repeated *double-entendres* as undesigned. This method of equivocation is fully recognised by Hebraists: Fuesat speaks of it as "the peculiar way of writing in order to denote at once both type and antitype." (*Lex.*, p. 893.)

prior manuscripts to casual negligence; the natural conclusion is that as they would testify against the later mutilations, the rabbinic option was conveniently extended to their safe destruction.

Yet the primary purport of some of the passages, metamorphosed by the rabbis, may doubtless be recovered in part by contrasting the modern context with the alternative or root-meanings of the words involved, and with their equivalents in cognate languages. Among such passages may be placed that known as the eighth chapter of the Book of Proverbs. That book is manifestly, and on its own avowal, an assemblage of ancient lore from various sources; and the chapter in question presents the features of an excerpt whose ultimate origin may have been as prologue to an Egyptian (or pre-Egyptian) treatise or ritual of astronomy, or, perhaps, a carticle to be arduically memorised by the alumni. But the science of the stars being tabooed by the Hebrew prejudice, a slight option of "meanings," and an almost imperceptible manipulation of a word or two, would serve to convert the original record of simple physical facts into an assumed "revelation" of supernatural bearing. The chapter has been a standing difficulty both to translators and theologians, for they followed the Hebrew example in postulating a primary mystic signification, unmindful that (as Mr. Gerald Massey points out) "the esoteric is the latest and not the primary interpretation of phenomena," and that "subtilised interpretations which have become doctrines and dogmas in theosophy have now to be tested by their genesis in physical phenomena, in order that we may explode their false pretensions to supernatural origin or superhuman knowledge."¹

To this end will be here presented a clear rendering of the chapter from the modern Hebrew text: in which rendering an attempt is made to restore the primitive meaning as it may have stood at the hands of its first Hebrew transcriber, prior to rabbinic censorship. Omitting the Masoretic "points" (introduced about 600 A.D.), the amount of difference between the two versions of the passage becomes so slight that it is difficult to understand how any recent translator should not have seen the intrinsically physical purport of the text. Yet it is, perhaps, this "physical" character of the original thesis—even so far as it survives in the later Hebrew text—that proved the very stumbling-block to innocent translators; for down to our own period such translation has only been entered upon by men of theological bias and purpose, who had no knowledge, or, at any rate, no pervading consciousness, of deep astronomic facts. By such men, therefore, even the most obvious suggestions of that science might pass unrecognised, the allusions be deemed unintelligible and corrupt, and a meaning be assigned that accorded with the rabbinic "orthodoxy."

¹ *The Natural Genesis*, i. 295, 318.

For it will be seen that the chapter is strictly of astronomic import, treating mainly of the phenomena connected with the "precession of the equinoxes," *e. g.*, the apparent displacement and gradual disappearance ("inversion" and "up-breaking," vv. 13-20) of certain of the constellations from the visible hemisphere of the heavens during a space of some 12,000 years, and their due re-appearance and restitution ("restoration" and "elevation," v. 13) for a similar period, together with the fact of observed repetitions and confirmations of these incidents (vv. 13, 14, 20, 31, 34, 35), and ulterior deductions based thereon as to permanence of existence or "immortality."

[In the ensuing translation modern terms are occasionally used to express more clearly a vague generality of the Hebrew; but any alteration involving more than recurrence to root-meaning or disregard of the later "Masoretic points" is marked by an asterisk, which then indicates the change of a given letter in the root for another of approximate shape or sound. No further licence has been taken, except that in vv. 22-31 the Hebrew usage of the first person and suffix of the third person *δακτικῶς* is treated impersonally. Alternative or explanatory words are added in brackets, and the usual numbering into verses is retained; while a further apportionment into "thesis" and antiphonal "chorus" or "scholium"—a division obviously suggested by the text itself—renders more clear the main argument, as follows:]

PROEM.

(1) Doth not science cry aloud? And understanding shall here give [explain] the voice thereof.

THESIS.

(2) In the movement of the celestial objects upon the way [the zodiac, ecliptic], the night-place of their trodden paths, she [science] stands displayed: beside the gates ["heaven's gate"] at the entrance of the concourse [of the celestial objects], at the portals of their rising and setting, she resounds: (4) To you, mortals, do I call; for my voice is unto the children of man. (5) Observe the expanses, the [starry] height, and the constellations; consider them with your intellect. (6) Hearken, for I will relate the order of things which are before your eyes; and the issue of my lips is [to show] concord [in that order of things].

SCHOLIUM.

(7) For my mouth enounces permanent truth, and wilful error is abhorrent to my lips; (8) all the averments of my mouth are reliable; nought in them is perverted or illusive; (9) all of them are manifest to whose understands, and concordant to those who have attained the knowledge of the same. (10) Take my instruction and not silver; and knowledge rather than proved gold; (11) for science is better than precious gems, and all other matters [delights] are not equivalent thereto. (33) Hearken to my instruction and become skilled in science, and pass it not by [v. 33 is omitted *entirely* in the Septuagint].

THESIS.

(12) I science frequent the starry height; and have attained to knowledge of the designs* [phenomena, constellations*]; (13) even to perceive* existent-law repeat periodically the [stellar] upbreaking, the restoration, and the elevation; for the way [the zodiac with its phenomena], and the upbreakings—after the manner of inversions—I have [seen] periodically repeated [“run a circuit”—Fuerst]. (14) I [know] the plan and its stability; I understand the same and the scope thereof.

SCHOLIUM.

(15) By me governments may ordain and lawgivers determine [the times and seasons] aright; (16) by me rulers may rule, leaders and all who govern in the land. (17) Those studying me do I befriend, and seeking me continually at early dawn they discover me. (18) With me is aggregation* of past events*; gain transcribed from labours of remote time, and the certitude of the same. (19) My fruit is better than gold, even refined gold, and my product than proven silver.

THESIS.

(20) I repeat my progress in a fixed period; in the middle of the usual paths I BECOME INVERTED: (21) thus causing those who study me to possess [know] continuous-existence, for their stores [? records] do I fulfil; SINCE IF I PREDICT TO YOU THE [CELESTIAL] EVENTS FROM DAY TO DAY, I REMEMBER AND ENUMERATE THEM OUT OF INFINITE AGES PAST.

[Quarls].—“In my predictions of phenomena about to happen, I shall not be making any extra-human revelation, but solely recounting from what has already been observed by man in times long past.” The two remarkable passages here given in capitals appear only in the Septuagint, and are presumedly from an earlier copy of the Hebrew text which had not undergone censorship.]

SCHOLIUM.

(22) Existent-law instituted the primal movement of the way [zodiac, ecliptic] in the East; as by the workings of the same from thence. (23) From time untold has it endured [been set up], as a movement from the eastern parts of the earth; (24) when there were no deeps it was circling; when were no well-springs heavy with water; (25) before the mountains were moulded to their elevated form it was circling; (26) while not yet was made the ground, even the outer wastes and the movable top soil [alluvium] of the fertile region. (27) When the sky was framing it was then existent, when the circle was described on the aspect of the deep; (28) when the clouds were restored above, when the well-springs of the deep became strong; (29) when the sea was hewn out, that the waters pass not over the border thereof; when the bases of the earth were forming.

THESIS.

(30) Thus have I [science] been collecting [storing*] and verifying [? observations], for I have been contemplating day by day,

meditating the aspect in every season: (31) meditating [also] the transitoriness* of the earth, for my contemplations were among the children of man.

EXORDIUM.

(32) Now therefore, O children, hearken unto me, and mark well the steps* [phases] of my way [the zodiac]. (34) Fortunate the man who heeds me, watching vigilantly at my doors day by day, to note the fluctuations [the appearances, disappearances, and re-appearances] at my portals. (35) *For my processions are processions of continuous life* [Septuagint]: For whoso discovers me, discovers in me continuous life [or being]: and deduces the concept* of ever-existent-law. (36) And whoso fails-to-discover me fails-to-discover* [or attain] his true self [vital power]; all they who reject me choose mortality.

[*Quodsi*.—that “intellect would continue to live or exist, but simple animality would cease by death”: or “that an intellect which already aspires or reaches beyond present life, will also exist beyond bodily death.”]

In these last two sentences, then, are summed certain conclusions as to continued individual existence, evolved by analogy from the observed repetitions of precession of the equinox, the incident of the sun's gradual progress through the signs of Zodiac: (*i.e.*, not his simple annual circuit, but the further movement by which his relative position gradually recedes, so that the vernal equinox—anciently counted the beginning of the year—occurs eventually in each sign in turn; the rate, however, being so slow that the grand circuit is only completed in about 25,800 years). From the reference in the text to “repetitions” of the phenomenon, it is presumable that at least two of these “greater years” had already been observed—and *record kept*—by tradition learnt by heart, by memorial stones or erections, by sculpture, or painting, or script.¹ The time involved may appear enormous, but we are steadily learning how cramped and futile have been our notions as to the period of man's existence—even as a skilled intellectual being—on this our earth.²

Theology adopted a closely corresponding conclusion as to man's continuing existence, in its own “orthodox” rendering of the same passage, though it shifted the venue by assigning “deity” to that which is more accurately translated as “ever-existent-law” (vv. 13,

¹ A striking evidence of these historic methods survives in the Hebrew root *qan*, which means, alternatively, “to pile up stones, to engrave, to paint, to write, and to translate.” (Compare Egyptian pyramids, sphinxes, and sculptures.)

² “We are only just beginning to apprehend how long time has been reckoned in the world. . . . The Egyptian priests informed Herodotus that time had been reckoned by them for so long that the sun (at the vernal equinox) had twice risen where it then set, and twice set where it then arose. This fact can only be realised as a fact in nature by means of two cycles of Precession, or a period of 51,736 years. . . . Martianus Capella reproduces a declaration that the Egyptians had secretly cultivated the science of astronomy for 40,000 years before it was made known to the rest of the world.”—Gerald Massey, *The Natural Genesis*, ii. 318.

22, 36). For the intrinsic and earlier signification of the word "Jhvh" is undoubtedly as here shown; M. Nicolas expresses not alone his own opinion, but that of all the first Hebraists of the day in the words—"C'est donc l'existence absolue que le terme 'Jahveh' exprime; il ne saurait rester le moindre doute à ce sujet" (*Études Critiques sur la Bible*). But it is not intended to introduce any polemical phase of the question here, the purpose of this paper being simply to point out a scientific and natural source for a conclusion which has been needlessly ascribed to supernatural communication; together with the failure of the Hebrew text to convey the abstract idea of permanent natural law, which the Egyptians deduced as the teaching of æons of astronomical observation and the verification that stars and constellations which had apparently perished for ever, did again reappear, and in pristine form and order.

The general impressions as to man's immortality, conditional or otherwise, and within or without the range of "orthodox" influence, will be found to be in touch with one or the other of the two forms of summary already given. Thus the second position, the "aspiration of the intellect" is well exemplified in the avowal of the agnostic St. Evremond—"I have read all that has been written on the immortality of the soul, and after I have done so with all possible attention, the clearest proof I find of the eternity of my soul is my own constant desire that it may be so." Some five centuries previously the first position finds expression in the Persian philosophy of Al Ghazzali—"There is no house prepared for thee after thy death, but that of which, before thy death, thou hast been the architect." While again a yet earlier compound of both the positions may be traced in the Indian mystic pronouncement of Ramakrishna Paramahansa—"Many are the names of God, and infinite the forms that lead us to know of him. In whatsoever name or form you desire to know him, in that very name and form you will know him."

But science has a yet loftier aim than appears in the Egyptian argument or the quoted modifications. The modern scientific thinker is not concerned unduly as to his individual immortality; he knows the vagueness of such a definition or aspiration, and he has calm confidence that individual effort for right will eventuate in some fitting sequence, however little he may be able to forecast the personal form of that result, or what further phase of being it may assume. On a broader and less selfish scale, moreover, one great result is visibly attainable, and claims his energies. The same course of observation which has proved the antiquity and enduringness of the celestial phenomena, evidences also the existence of the human type during a protracted period. The race continues, even though the individual disappear; and he, as one sentient atom of that humanity, finds a sufficing content in the security that he can at least help to increase the happiness of the portion of humanity which is yet to

come. For science differs from theology in this—that every acquisition of science becomes an increasing wealth of mankind, in which the successive generations profit by the betterment of condition, material and mental; while theology appeals only to the individual self, the result of whose effort accrues to that self alone, and can in no way avail to alter the fate of the assertedly birth-guilty mortals still to ensue.

Yet the scientific spirit does not occupy itself solely (as is scoffingly reported) with materialities or temporalities. It has a wider, fuller, higher scope; it holds alien to itself nothing that is of human interest—be it mortal or immortal, the wisdom of the philosopher or the wisdom of the poet. Thus does it not exclude, but welcomes—as light and as air—the sublime deduction by Robert Browning:

“All we have willed or hoped or dreamed of good shall exist:
Not its semblance, but itself; no beauty, nor good, nor power,
Whose voice has gone forth, but each survives for the melodist
When eternity affirms the conception of an hour.”

It is an inspiring creed, for—so far as the deepest pointings of science can be adduced in confirmation—it is a true one.

BEN ELMY.

NOTE.—Those who object to the rendering of the word “*h'rosh*” (v. 2) as “In the movement” cannot refuse the alternative, “*In the varying beginning place*,” an assertion equally accordant with the astronomic fact. English readers interested in the vast antiquity of astronomical research and knowledge will find the subject excellently treated in Mr. Gerald Massey’s monumental volumes, *A Book of the Beginnings* and *The Natural Genesis*. These works are “written by an Evolutionist for Evolutionists,” and are in their own sphere a contribution as notable and valuable as that of Darwin himself to “the new order of thought that has been inaugurated in our own era.” It is matter for congratulation that Mr. Massey is still carrying on his magnanimous though little-recognised labours.

THE ALFRED MEDAL OF 1901.

MEDALS have ever been, with persons of taste, one of the most delightful of studies—one of the most engaging of arts, one of the most enduring of memorials, while they become one of the most fascinating of hobbies.

The earliest of the Italian medallions appear to have been executed about the years 1440–50, *i.e.*, at the period of the first uprising of the spirit of imitation of the antique, brought to such perfection by the patronage of Lorenzo the Magnificent. Greek and Roman medals, and engraved gems, had, however, long before engaged the attention of men of learning and connoisseurs; and at last the artists also became alive to the infinite superiority of the ancients, manifested in their so-called minor productions. Medals, in this way, became the study of painters, architects, sculptors, goldsmiths, while in rarer cases (with men of letters) with a success which so infatuated the beholders of these all-glorious treasures, being literary performances as well as a grander development of the moneyers' art, that princes and men of learning, statesmen with churchmen, poets with soldiers, at once showed a kind of universal solicitude for sending down to posterity the lineaments of their faces—while the obverse of medals record those chivalrous actions of the truly great, framed for you and me to contemplate. In this way, Italy alone has the latter part of her history written in bronze. If I mistake not, the earliest known English medal, with the stamp of absolute truth upon it, is dated 1480; it was found in Knaresborough Forest, and is of Italian workmanship. On one side there is a bust, the inscription being as follows: JO. KENDAL. RHODI TYRCYPELLERIVS; on the obverse are found the arms of Kendal, TEMPORE OBSIDIONIS TYRCORVM. MCCCCLXXX.

The study of coins (and hence that of medals) has occupied the greatest talent of every age, while the moneyers of most countries, so to speak, have vied with each other to produce work which should eclipse the chief masterpieces of the rarest examples. Those students who have tried to form a collection of the medals of the Popes will at once endorse the truth of this statement. In this place it might be mentioned that medals with portraits on both sides are rare and of considerable value, while the greatest care must be taken to see if they are not what is commonly called "soldered" medals—in other words, forgeries.

With the study of medals, it is not a question of what age, nor is it a question of what metal (precious or otherwise) that has been the crowning point of any achievement—the joyaunce has always been in that which shall have been produced (in later times) by a Pisano, a Benvenuto Cellini, and a Wyon.

The names above noted (not to the exclusion of the most ancient masters of the Hellenic art) are among the greatest associated with the production of medals, while but few Englishmen are aware that there are extant in these realms of ours certain coins of the age of Cynobelin (that is if they are not medals), which are the only examples of that period which can be called British. This is the opinion of the famous Pinkerton. Most of these examples have CVNO upon one side, with an ear of corn, a horse, a kind of Janus head, and some such symbol; and frequently CAMV, thought to be the initials of Camudolanum, upon the one side, with a boar and tree, with a variety of other badges on the obverse. They have likewise frequently the word TASCIA upon them, not hitherto explained, though by some writers absurdly supposed to be the name of the moneyer. But in point of fact, the putting of the name of the moneyer on coins was a late practice, quite unknown till the sixth century. It came in gradually, a century after the Roman mints had ceased in Europe, with the empire, and when private persons contracted with the kings for the little mints, they put their names to identify their mintage. These examples are mostly found in copper; but some in gold, silver, and electrum, or a mixture of the two last. One of these has the word VER, whatever that may be, on the reverse, which has been thought to represent Verulamium, and other legends and inscriptions. The British Museum has a very fine collection, formerly the property of Sir Robert Cotton.

On the other hand, while it is not absolutely known if the whole of these examples are types of the coinage of Britain, one thing is certain—many coins also occur with legends, which, though meant for Latin characters, and in imitation of Latin coins, are so perverted as to be illegible, and for this reason are generally termed “barbarous medals.” Let all this be as it may, how happy are we Britons in possessing those glorious examples which Pinkerton presents to our gaze in plate No. 3 of his work upon medals published in 1808, each of the ten examples there given having more of the medal than the coin about them! If so-called great sculptors would only study the antique instead of inflicting their half-thought out monstrosities upon the eyes of the people at large, there would be less to find fault with in the images stuck up everywhere—not to mention that vile thing of our late most dearly beloved Queen and Empress, at Brighton—in most cases something more than a caricature burlesquing the prototype to a painful degree—a disgrace to the ground they stand upon.

In this England of ours coins and medals have been so closely associated, from the days of our Roman invaders to the Age of our good King Alfred, and from his epoch to that of our all glorious Queen Victoria, that we shall do well to consider what Cæsar has written down from his observations when he entered Britain.

Speaking of our progenitors, he says: *Utuntur tamen ere, ut nummo aureo, aut anulis ferris ad certum pondus examinatis, pro nummis*—they make use of brass instead of golden coin, or iron



rings reduced to a certain weight instead of (our brass) coins. So the passage stands in the first edition published at Rome in 1469; but it has been miserably mangled in later editions, especially those of Joseph Scaliger, a critic, whose publications cannot be too severely condemned, as he foisted every dream of his own into the text of ancient authors, by way of correction. Cæsar's meaning clearly is, that our ancestors used brass, apparently coined, as a superior metal, in like manner as more advanced nations used gold. And that *pro nummis*, instead of the brass coinage of Rome (nummus being a peculiar name of the brass sestertius), they used iron rings, examined and reduced to a stated weight. Rude coins of copper, much mingled with tin, are frequently found in England; and may perhaps be the copper coins used by our ancestors, for Cæsar's expression surely infers that their copper was in the form of coins. These pieces are of the size of a didrachm, the common form of the *nummus aureus* among the ancients.

Though Julius Cæsar made no progress in Britain, and Claudius a century after really began the so-called conquest of this island of ours, yet as all Gaul was effectually under Roman power, the Britons began to admit Roman arts. But the true idea we are to form of Britain, from the time of Cæsar to that of Claudius, is that it was *unconquered* by the Romans, while our glorious ancestors were sufficiently sensible of the Roman power and its superior civilisation. Augustus was proceeding against it when he was stopped by our ambassadors, who offered such terms (in hard cash, of course), as he accepted. It is extremely interesting to know that Julius Cæsar had engaged to maintain the Trinobantes, of Middlesex and Essex, against Cassivelaunus, his chief foe in these realms of ours, who was king of the Cassii of Buckinghamshire, &c., &c. Cunobelin, of whom we perhaps have so many coins, was king of the Trinobantes, and educated, as it is said, in the court of Augustus. He is mentioned by Suetonius and Dio. As to any king holding supreme authority in Britain at that time, that is a matter of pure conjecture.

Pray forgive this digression on account of its great importance to Englishmen generally, not one person in ten thousand knowing anything about its subject matter. Nor is this the place to discriminate between good and bad, or the proper sort of medals which a *virtuoso* should collect; the present writer simply wishes to lead yourself onward that you may the better contemplate the glorious achievements of Alfred the Great, the "Truth Teller."

Medals there are of King Alfred, for there are two, both issued in 1849. That which was issued in a public way has upon the obverse, enshrined within a beautifully designed wreath, the following words: "The British Empire, United States, and Anglo-Saxons everywhere." Above this inscription is a representation of the "holy" dove, while round the edge of this medal runs these words: "Alfred and His Children, 1849," the king's name being on the reverse. Both these medals were designed by the early friend of the present writer, Martin Farquhar Tupper, D.C.L., the author of that wondrous book which few have the courage to study in these last days, the *Proverbial Philosophy*, the rarer example having on the obverse the heraldic shields of England and America, which Dr. Tupper thought would be of the greater interest to intellectual people for a reason that is obvious. Both medals have the same head of the king, which is taken from the earliest known portrait of King Alfred, preserved in a manuscript in the Cottonian collection (*Claud D.*, vj. s. xiv), the rarer example of these medals having Dr. Tupper's name as the designer of the same, and that of the medallist, W. J. Taylor, of London, on the obverse.

Respecting the conception which the present writer has been the humble means of presenting to your gaze, a very few words shall be

necessary. He had but one thought; he only desired to send down to posterity that which came to his hands after much research, with the stamp of Truth upon it. For this purpose he read almost every genuine antiquarian work that could be called such, with many manuscripts in public collections thought likely to assist him in giving to the world at large, a thousand years after the death of the king, the lively effigies of Alfred the Great of Blessed Memory. At length, having almost exhausted the list of those true antiquarian works which he had previously drawn up for consultation—the labours of the famous John Selden (who never put pen to paper without a good reason for so doing) yielded the sum of delight, which at once so impressed me with the majesty of the portraiture of King Alfred, which this “judicious” antiquarian singled out for veneration in his *Titles of Honour* [which he reproduces from one of the coins of the king at page 133 of his 1672 edition of the above work, where he discriminates and enlarges upon the exact sort of crown which our good king wore], that I said to myself this is the sum of delight which my countrymen will venerate for evermore. In this dignified portrait of the “Mirrour of Princes” above represented, will be seen the only crown which the “Truth Teller” wore, while the *Cynhelme*, of which we have heard so much of late, is a thing which never stood upon the head of his Majesty.

In a word, you behold at the head of these remarks the sum and substance of my labours; whether it be to your taste in such matters or not is a matter over which I have not the slightest control, the moneyer's art alone being responsible for the lineaments of the king's face, the portrait of our universally venerated and beloved king being good enough for the learned and judicious John Selden to single out for posterity to contemplate, left nothing for myself to desire.

Rejoicing over the discovery of this highly intellectual portrait of King Alfred, I at once set myself the task of enlarging the same, and placed it within a wreath of the *Laurus nobilis*, the “Poet's Bay.” I do not give you a debased portrait of our king of the thirteenth century, as seen in the medal of my early friend's designing, I give you an exact copy of the portraiture of King Alfred which his moneyer placed upon the coinage of the king by “authority”; and it is not necessary to write another word upon that matter, the design for the block being made by that highly gifted black and white artist, Ernest Cousins. As a work of art this medal holds its own with anything of its kind issued during the Christian era, and at once ranks with the *chef d'œuvre* of Anglo-Saxon art, while nothing of its kind is extant. The force of circumstances demanding the lettering should be in English of to-day, the formation of the *laurei* being the same in the days of Alfred, as now.

With respect to the portrait itself of the king, a good deal has

been written by the present writer in another place ; while the portrait which is given in this medal of the Millenary of King Alfred's death, 1901, is a *real* one. Without going into physiognomic details, this portrait is one which clearly demonstrates the noble race from which we Britons spring. The head as represented in this medal, taken from a coin of Alfred—line for line with the original—which the judicious Selden singles out from the numerous examples still extant, is a fairly good representative formation of the cranium of the average Englishman. Most certainly it is otherwise than the type everywhere to be seen in Norfolk and Suffolk. This head of Alfred the Great, of Alfred the "Truth Teller," is the shape of that of our Chaucer, of our Gower, of our Lord Bacon, of our Shakespeare, of our Browning, and of our Tennyson.

RICHARD C. JACKSON.

THE GENESIS OF WORSHIP.

WESTERN Christendom has begun to realise that the twentieth century is destined to witness the final struggle of Christianity, at all events in its present form, for existence. The spread of elementary and higher education, the popularising of scientific study, the opening of the universities to democracy and their increasing attraction for the laity, as well as the slow but steady growth of the influence of Rationalism within the Church herself, have wrought a great change upon the British mind during the past fifty years. The wiser of the clergy, both of the Anglican and the more liberal Nonconformist sections of the Christian Church, are already adapting their theology to the requirements of a more exact and enlightened age, and even less progressive theologians have not failed to grasp the significance of the change in the intellectual atmosphere, but, less willing to yield, are attempting to stem the torrent and, like Dame Partington, to sweep back the flood by a "new Evangelical" movement, inaugurated to restore religion to the more supernatural sphere it formerly occupied. By them we are invited back to the "gospel of grace"; missionaries are sent through the land to wean men from the guidance of the head and to offer them a tempting but valueless substitute in the dictates of the emotions. The most modern form of anthropomorphism is also the most dangerous, because it bases its claim not merely upon history, but upon ethics, and regards sociology as a dependent system. "Society cannot remain society without a spiritual power" is the latest adaptation of what Frederick Denison Maurice said, with more consideration for scientific fact, when he declared that if men are to unite it must be in something above themselves.

Two alternatives are offered to man upon which to build the union of his race—the anthropomorphic finity of the Evangelicals and the Unknowable Infinity of science. The psychologist will have no difficulty in making his choice. To him it will immediately become obvious that worship, whatever its object, finds its cause in mystery, in negation. It is not knowledge, but the conscious absence of knowledge, which sets our reverential faculty at work, and the elementary stage of such a mental condition as begets worship is found in the awe of the simple-minded at the uncanny. The savage who sets up a stone and worships it finds the object of

his veneration, not in the stone itself,* but in the mysterious power with which his imagination has endowed it. Destroy the imaginary existence of that power, show him his quondam idol to be a mass of matter possessing the same properties as any other similar piece of mineral, and his reverence gives place to rational regard. If worship is to be eternal and absolute, it cannot content itself with the merely relatively unknown as the object of its activity; it demands the Unknowable—that which is not only unknown, but which never can be known. If the object of our worship is merely unknown, but knowable, it is conceivable that there may come a time when the devotee will know it, his understanding will drive out the mystery, and his reverence will instinctively cease. We are, therefore, led by logic to the only possible conclusion, that it is no finite deity, subject to analysis and classification, but that “which passeth all understanding,” that alone can be the object of the eternal worship.

The Evangelical paradox of a future state where all mystery shall cease and yet divine worship continue, or even increase, is a burden laid by anthropomorphism upon the shoulders of modern Christianity which she must cast off or she will break down under the strain. This the more thoughtful of her leaders have foreseen, and they have lost no time in pointing the moral. They have insisted upon a rational conception of the doctrine of eternal life, not as a promise of a *post mortem* existence, but as a condition of mind. The late Professor Drummond, to quote but one example, admonished his fellow schoolmen that “no truth of Christianity has been more ignorantly or wilfully travestied than the doctrine of immortality,” but, in spite of powerful warning from within, and still more potent portents of scientific discovery without, the Christian Church, as a whole, has closed her eyes to the coming crisis. Such an attitude is the more shortsighted on her part because the necessary sacrifice demanded of Evangelicalism would involve no important loss either to the power or to the needs of Christianity. It is usual to speak of the conflict between religion and science, but no such conflict between these elements, rightly understood, does or can exist. The “irreconcilable difference” is between the theology of the Christian Church and the theology of science, and it is presented, not by the question of the existence of evil, nor even, as Mr. Balfour appears to think, by the question of miracles merely,¹ but is founded upon the far broader basis of psychology. While the Church holds to the ultra-psychological character of the soul, differentiates between the “spiritual” and the moral, and postulates an objective revelation of God, scientific naturalism excludes such theories as both rationally and logically unjustifiable, and is content, as well might be, with the evidence of the all-sufficiency of psychic energy to explain mental phenomena, and of the limitation of divine revelation to subjective sense.

¹ *Foundations of Belief*. A. J. Balfour. P. 307.

Religion has everything to gain and less than nothing to lose by the substitution of supernaturalism by rationalism. The objection raised by Evangelicalism, which draws its vitality from the wells of emotion, that a theology which sets out upon an investigation of the evidence of the existence of God on the system of rational observation applied to the location of a seam of coal is neither seemly nor sufficient for the purposes of "religion" is both ill-founded and misleading. Religion has so often been dragged down to the level of a sect or of a school that we are apt to forget that to be real it must, whether this be recognised or not, be universal. The term is not ecclesiastical but scientific and stands, in correct etymology, for that bond which unites phenomena to "that which is behind phenomena and of which phenomena are but the manifestations." Paraphrased it is the observance of the law of obligation which operates throughout the natural world. This insistence upon the emotional rather than the rational character of religion is the cardinal error of the "new Evangelicalism"; indeed, it would be more correct to regard it as instinctive than as emotional, for it is instinctive to a certain degree in man and, apparently, altogether so in the less developed forms of organic life, where reason appears to be absent. The law of obligation is universal; it is responsible for the Hedonism of plant life and lower animalism and becomes rational when it plays upon the psychic nature of man, who not merely obeys but appreciates the penalty of disobedience—death! Not by the supernatural decree of enraged deity, but by the orderly process of nature, the logical outcome alike of a wanton or unconscious infringement of the scheme of life. The man who sins, that is, who disturbs the rhythm of natural progress, whether in the physical or the psychological sphere, awaits no future judgment, no sword of Damocles is suspended over his head by a threatening but hesitating fate; he "is condemned." He may put himself into harmony with nature again, but until he does so his punishment is the natural result of his own conduct. Nonconformity with the ordered whole, of which he is an integral part, is his Gehenna.

A theological system, therefore, which refuses to acknowledge submission to the inexorable laws of nature, feeding its adherents with false hopes that these can be broken by "grace" for the special benefit of the faithful, must inevitably come to grief in any conflict with the more scientific scheme by which Rationalism brings the principles of human conduct into line with the scheme of the universe. A struggle between æsthetic sentiment and stern necessity can have but one result. There is still time, however, for the Christian Church to save herself, but it will require the supreme sacrifice of her curriculum—the gift of her life, as it is lived to-day. She must throw off all weights, go back again to the starting point, the simple yet scientific natural philosophy of the Agnostic of

Nazareth, who checked the analytical passions of vulgar materialism eager to reduce the Infinite to terms of time and space, and she must confess that she has degraded into an ecclesiastical organisation, prolific of endless dissensions and doomed to eventual social and moral chaos, what was intended to become the world's first principle of sociology—the brotherhood of man, based upon the universal union of humanity in the eternal worship of the Unknowable.

C. PENRHYN GASQUOINE.

AGNOSTICISM.

A REPLY TO MR. FRANCIS GRIERSON.

THERE appeared in the October number of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW an article under the title of "The Agnostic's Agony," which, containing as it did so many surprising errors and misconceptions, certainly calls for a reply. Why the writer chose such an extraordinary title is not at all clear. If he meant to imply that to be an Agnostic is to endure agony, I can assure him that he is entirely wrong. *Bien au contraire.* He says that he personally can testify to the "mental torture" and irritability of disposition caused by Agnosticism, but I think it would have been far better if he had consulted a specialist in nervous disorders when he discovered these symptoms, instead of ascribing his state to what was ostensibly his religious belief, for it is at once clear from his article that he has never properly understood the much-abused "ism" he endeavours to combat. If, on the other hand, it is sought to prove that Agnosticism, taken in its most general aspect, is a decaying force, I think our critic will be found to be as much at fault in this case as in the other.

Before considering the article in detail, it is essential that we should have an accurate definition of the word and its scope. I take Agnosticism to be the state of mind at which a man has arrived when, in reasoning upon the problems of religion, he has not sufficient reason for saying "Yes" or "No." The impression that would most certainly be given to the reader by Mr. Grierson is that Agnostics are a class of thinkers without activity and sluggish to the last degree—men who habitually decline to consider any evidence whatever, contenting themselves with ignoring the vast strides of science, or at best dismissing them with a casual "I do not know." (Mr. Grierson, by the way, seems to forget the fact that Agnostics are responsible for many of these giant strides.) But never was a more mistaken impression given to the world. The Agnostic is an earnest seeker after truth, and so far from being, as one would suppose from the article in question, much after the style of Tennyson's "Lotos-eaters," he is a man of activity and energy, usually erudite above the average, and possessing a quality seldom found, that of impartiality, together with great catholicity of spirit. It is,

then; incorrect to say that he is one who says, "I do not know"; it would be more correct to say that he is one who, having weighed the evidence to the best of his ability, is *thereby* compelled to say, "I do not know." It would not, moreover, be inappropriate to add that he would very much like to know.

Coming now to the scope of Agnosticism, we here notice one of Mr. Grierson's most striking errors, an error which vitiates the whole of his reasoning and which accounts for the greater part of the irrelevancy in his article, which, to tell the truth, has very little to do with the title he has chosen.

Agnosticism, as a state of mind, is essentially confined to religious phenomena and those great scientific enigmas which have a direct bearing upon religion. When Mr. Grierson applies the word to the whole world of science and commerce he is simply giving another name to the caution and common-sense which should be inherent in every man. Viewed in his (Mr. Grierson's) light, it is universal, common to all men and all times. That it does exist to this extent I do not deny, but it is absurd for Mr. Grierson to lay the whole blame upon Agnostics, simply because he conceives that the trend of thought is becoming too sceptical, a proposition which, to say the least, is very questionable. So far from deploring this widespread Agnosticism, it ought rather to be a matter for regret that it is not more vigorous. I will not weary the reader with instances, but I think it will be generally admitted that, if the present Government had infused more of that spirit into its investigations of those intangible Ulster grievances and other questions connected with the war, we should have profited much as a nation. But this application of the word Agnosticism to matters of everyday life is erroneous—it has not yet attained that broad signification, and I do not believe Huxley, who was responsible for the term, intended that it should. So far as I can gather from his remarks on its etymology, he never intended the word to be used outside the scope I have indicated above. Yet Mr. Grierson proceeds on this wrong basis and succeeds in producing for the benefit of the uninitiated what I cannot help but say is a ridiculous travesty of Agnosticism.

Accepting, however, the foregoing definition of Agnosticism and its scope, let us examine as briefly as possible some of the most noteworthy points of the article.

The first matter to claim our attention is a comparison between Pessimism and Agnosticism, which is manifestly intended to be unfavourable to the latter. Why this comparison was instituted it would be difficult to say. We are told that an Agnostic has to live without "the aid of any religious system or ism" in a manner that would imply that the Agnostic suffers some hardship in electing to live in this way; but such is not the case. We have the consolation of knowing that, even if we cannot discover the truth,

we at least do not believe in that which is false." I do not think it is necessary to detain the reader on the question of Pessimism and Agnosticism. Every one knows the pessimist maxims: "If God made this world, I would not be that God, for the misery of it would break my heart," and "The world is bankrupt at all ends, and life is a business that does not pay expenses," and so on. Those who have not already studied the merits of the two "isms" would do well to read first *The Misery of Life*, which is typical of Pessimism, by Schopenhauer, and then one of Herbert Spencer's Synthetic Philosophy—say *The Principles of Ethics*. In the one he will find, with wearying frequency, lugubrious expressions of regret at the pains of life, and a constant endeavour to prove that it were better for us not to be; in the other he will find stamped on every page a vigorous optimism which, although taking full account of the trials of humanity, holds that these trials can be conquered by facing them, and that the destiny of man tends ever higher, approximating nearer generation by generation, to the perfect state of society.

As for the assertion that "an avowed sceptic is never welcome in any company," I deny it emphatically. It is true that such cases occasionally happen, but they are invariably due to intolerance or ignorance.

Mr. Grierson next forms a most misleading analogy, which fails at every point. I refer to that part of his article wherein he speaks of an army commanded by a general ignorant of his opponents, &c., but I need scarcely point out that, as the Agnostic is not ignorant and apathetic, the comparison is of no value.

When Mr. Grierson refers to the "old-fashioned scientist who denied everything new" I decline to follow him. If he can name a few agnostic scientists of so great bigotry and conservatism, let him do so, but for my part I do not think there have existed any such outside his (Mr. Grierson's) imagination. It would be superfluous to remind the reader that his phrase is, moreover, in direct contradiction to historical fact. The division of Agnostics into two classes—the wilfully apathetic and those who wish to learn—is certainly new; personally, I have never met one of the former class.

We are next told that "the Agnostic in getting rid of illusion has placed himself in a state of helplessness; he is like one who has fasted too long, his digestive organs come at last to refuse nourishment"; this being identical in meaning with an earlier remark—"if the period of scepticism be prolonged, a sort of psychological atrophy develops which often ends in a state of chronic apathy." In criticising these propositions the most obvious remark that strikes one is just that which Mr. Grierson has apparently overlooked—that the Agnostic, in ridding himself of error, has obtained an open and unprejudiced mind, indispensable for the proper discussion of any question, whereas he who believes in that which is false has first to clear

away his misconceptions, often a matter of the greatest difficulty. As for that "state of psychological atrophy," the fair-minded reader will decide readily in which case it is most likely to occur—the Agnostic who with faculties alert and active is ever ready to discuss the evidences without bias, or the average believer who straightway falls into a quiescent attitude, allowing his brain to become totally dormant. The reply is not difficult to forecast.

"The man who believes and expects something is far more interesting than the man who believes and expects nothing." A very remarkable observation is this. It is a great pity we are not told why the believer is far more interesting. But it is sufficient to remark that the Agnostic does not wish to be interesting at the cost of sacrificing his principle; rather than subscribe to a creed he believes false he prefers to be "not interesting."

Throughout the whole of Mr. Grierson's article this idea shows itself, that Agnosticism is a most reprehensible state of mind, and that a man should believe in something; what that something is we are not told. There is one of Ruskin's finest passages which is singularly applicable to this idea. The exact quotation fails me at the moment, but it was on the occasion of one of the great Seer's visits to Switzerland, and he was admiring the beauty of Nature, how all things seemed formed to charm the eye, the trees and the verdant foliage everywhere, while here and there, nestling among the mountain sides, were seen the peasants' cottages, forming in its *ensemble* a harmonious whole. And Ruskin tells us how profoundly he was saddened by the thought that inside those cottages there reigned such a dark night of ignorance. The same can be said with equal emphasis of many of the cases of childlike faith that we see in religious belief; the

"Life that leads melodious days"

is unfortunately accompanied too often by an utter lack of knowledge on the most elementary points of the believer's creed.

But to proceed. Mr. Grierson says, "No one reads philosophy," a statement which the reader may assess at its proper value, although it is little relevant to Agnosticism. "Some of the most successful inventors of to-day would have passed for madmen twenty years ago." This may be a recommendation; if so, let it be at once said that many consider Darwin a madman even now. "Sermons no longer interest." In this connection it may well be asked, "To whom is this change due if not to scientists?" It is considered by many that the religion of the future will be a compromise between Christianity and Agnosticism. "No one can work and wait at the same time," and "they (Agnostics) sit still and rub their eyes at every fresh discovery, crying, 'I do not know.'" Now from one of Mr. Grierson's calibre we expect better things than this; he

constantly levels the charges of ignorance, apathy and contempt of new knowledge against Agnostics, and nowhere does he particularise or cite facts in support of his contentions. He digresses into Capitalism and Millionairism in his anxiety to confound Agnosticism, and here again I have to differ from him on a question of fact. In his overdrawn metaphor he says, "At its worst, the doctrine of the survival of the fittest is a gilded lie; at its best, a ghost at a banquet"; and "... it gives a moral as well as a material law to strengthen them (the capitalists) in every act of folly, avidity and cunning." The idea of the modern millionaire stopping to derive a "moral and material law" from the philosophy of evolution is delightfully entertaining. The notion is absurd. So far as I know, there is not a single professed Agnostic in the ranks of the millionaires. But, assuming Mr. Grierson's observation as correct, and granting, for argument's sake, that certain moral and material evils have resulted from the misunderstanding of the evolutionary doctrine, what follows? That because Agnostics are responsible for the discovery of this truth they are to be condemned? By no means. Passing from the abstract to the concrete world for a moment, let us take an example there; say the discovery of various poisons by chemists and others. The wrong use of these has resulted in numerous deaths, yet are the patient investigators who made the discoveries to be responsible for the misapplications of others? We shall be told, I know, that under certain circumstances the use of poisons is most useful and productive of good. Then the retort is obvious, that so, too, is the doctrine of the survival of the fittest; even in regard to capitalism (for which Agnostics hold no brief) it has produced good results. Mr. Carnegie is a splendid example, and in America the gifts of millionaires to the universities are counted in hundreds of thousands of dollars. Sufficient has been said here, I think, to show that Mr. Grierson's position is untenable.

And now, after all this would-be destructive criticism, all this vain beating of the air, what has Mr. Grierson to offer us? He has attempted to demonstrate that Agnosticism is played out and effete, he has railed against Darwinism, and accused us of want of energy and ignorance, so that it is right that we should demand of him something in the way of a constructive "ism." Yet he offers us nothing. He gives us a few instances of the remarkable advances of science in recent years—advances which Agnostics have watched quite as sympathetically as any other class of thinkers, and on the basis of these few facts he wishes us to renounce our "ism" and join him in—what? He does not say. If he means that Agnostics should give more attention to psychic and telepathic phenomena, then the advice is totally unnecessary. It is a fact that the laws of mind have been too much neglected; things physical have been studied to the exclusion of things psychical, but that is not the fault

of Agnosticism. If proof of this were needed, the favourable reception accorded to M. Camille Flammarion's book, *The Unknown*, would suffice. As a recent writer well said, it might plausibly be argued that the average man does not care a straw about these abstruse matters, in view of the fact that the Psychical Research Society is practically unknown and receives only the most meagre support. Be that as it may, Agnostics welcome the daily increasing number of investigators into the laws of mind, and follow with the deepest interest each new step into the realm of the hitherto unknown. But the discovery that originated with Lamarck, and was developed by Darwin and Spencer, will rank always as one of the most important ever made. Mr. Grierson grants that Tyndall, Haeckel, and Huxley all did a work that had to be done, yet he accuses them of apathy and lack of energy! As a final refutation of the charge of ignorance, let the reader turn to Herbert Spencer's *Synthetic Philosophy*; in the whole history of human thought it is nowhere excelled—it is one of the most monumental tasks ever completed by one man.

To sum up, however, there are not yet sufficient grounds to warrant the Agnostic rushing into the extreme state of positivism indicated by our critic—his (Mr. Grierson's) facts are not relevant to Agnosticism proper, and the study of telepathy and kindred questions is not sufficiently developed. That "attempts are being made" to ascertain certain things proves nothing, and until we have reliable data on which we can generalise with certainty, we shall rest content, having the moral courage to disregard "mental agony," if ever it exist, so that, having fought the good fight, we can face the end with unwavering fortitude, each

"As one who wraps the drapery of his couch around him
And lies down to pleasant dreams."

G. L.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

AN excellent text-book of elementary botany has just been published,¹ and will be heartily welcomed by all who, while anxious to gain some knowledge of that science, are yet deterred by the copious technical terms with which most botanical books abound. Some special words are, of course, necessary in every science; but in this case the authoress has carefully avoided a too copious use of them, and the explanations given are clear and concise. The illustrations are numerous, and have been well drawn by Miss W. L. Boys-Smith. Altogether, we can strongly recommend this work to any one wishing to acquire a knowledge of the main elements of botany.

Not the least of the advantages conferred by the British Association for the Advancement of Science on the localities visited by it annually are the handbooks on local points of scientific interest. In connection with the Glasgow meeting three such handbooks were published. That on the *Fauna, Flora, and Geology of the Clyde Area*² is of considerable importance, and will remain a valuable work of reference for local scientific subjects for many years. Some of the sections are mere lists of names, with localities more or less accurately indicated; others are interesting memoirs on special subjects by authors who have elsewhere contributed materially to our knowledge of the branches with which they deal. Among the latter class we may mention: *The Geology of the Clyde Territory*, by J. Home; *The Crystalline Schists of the Highlands*, by P. Macnair; *The Drift or Glacial Formation*, by J. Smith; and the *Physical Conditions of the Clyde Sea Area*, by H. R. Mill. A good coloured map illustrates several of the papers, and this alone would be found a very useful guide by any scientific man visiting the district.

We are ourselves so dependent upon the vegetable world for our supplies of food that all relating to the nourishment of plants should be of deep interest to us, far more so, indeed, than is usually the case. For many years a band of devoted workers have been grappling with the difficult problem of how best to utilise those

¹ *A Text-Book of Elementary Botany*. By C. L. Laurie. London: Allman & Sons, Ltd.

² *Fauna, Flora, and Geology of the Clyde Area*. Edited by G. F. S. Elliot, M. Laurie, and J. B. Murdoch. Glasgow: J. Maclehose & Sons. 1901.

plant-foods which are known to be most essential to the growth of our chief crops. Dr. Bernard Dyer has made an important addition to our knowledge of the subject¹ by his study of the Phosphoric Acid and Potash in the soil of one of the fields of the celebrated experimental farm at Rothamsted. By means of a large number of analyses the author throws much light upon the migration of these important plant-constituents, and we can recommend a perusal of his work to all who are interested in the improvement of agricultural methods.

Another branch of scientific research in which much good work is being done is the investigation of fatty substances and oils, the chemistry of which is still obscure. A valuable contribution to the bibliography of this subject has just been published as part of the *Jahrbuch der Chemie*.² In it Dr. Lewkowitsch, himself a well-known authority on these matters, gives an excellent summary of recent additions to our knowledge of fats, oils, and waxes. In these days of specialisation it is not easy for the chemist to collect all the literature bearing upon any subject, and it is a great advantage to have this done by one who, like Dr. Lewkowitsch, is so eminently capable of separating the wheat from the chaff.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

EVEN Hegel, seriously and intelligently interpreted, can be made interesting; and we may congratulate Mr. McTaggart upon having achieved this measure of success. Not that even Mr. McTaggart's *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology*³ are exactly easy reading, but they arrest the attention of the reader and contribute to his enlightenment. Our author's definition of cosmology is, the application to subject-matter empirically known, of *a priori* conclusions derived from the investigation of the nature of pure thought. The empirical things thus referred to are such as the human and absolute self, punishment, sin, love, &c.—things which the writer says suggest questions which cannot be dealt with by the finite sciences—they cannot be settled by observation nor determined by induction; the only possible treatment of such subjects is metaphysical. Here we are disposed to utter a word of protest against the introduction

¹ *A Chemical Study of the Phosphoric Acid and Potash Contents of the Wheat Soils of Broadbalk Field, Rothamsted.* By Bernard Dyer. London: Dulau & Co., for the Royal Society. 1901.

² *Technologie der Fette und Erdöle.* Von J. Lewkowitsch. Brunswick: F. Vieweg und Sohn. 1901.

³ *Studies in Hegelian Cosmology.* By John McTaggart Ellis McTaggart, M.A. Cambridge: the University Press. 1901.

of the word "only." So far as these subjects have empirical elements in them they must be investigated by observation and induction; after that is done, we may see how far they can be explained by metaphysics. And there is a good deal of observation and induction in this book by which the reader may profit. The writer has an intention in calling his subject "Hegelian Cosmology," and not the cosmology of Hegel—it is rather consequences drawn by some disciples from Hegel's teaching than the direct pronouncements of Hegel himself; so Mr. McTaggart devotes a good deal of his space to discussing the views of Lotze, Mr. Bradley and Professor Mackenzie; a perfectly legitimate proceeding, and all the more useful as, no doubt, the majority of people who know anything at all about Hegel know him principally through his followers. It is unnecessary for us to follow Mr. McTaggart in his discussion of such great themes as Human Immortality, the Personality of the Absolute, and so on, and must content ourselves with a reference to a more popular side of the subject which attracts the attention of religious people—namely, Hegelianism and Christianity. Mr. McTaggart discusses the very interesting question whether Hegel was a Christian, and whether in calling his philosophy Christian he was guilty of deception. Our author holds that Hegel's system was not Christian nor in accordance with any orthodox form of Christianity, but he was not, therefore, in any sense dishonest in calling it Christian. He merely meant that Christianity, while being far from absolute truth, came nevertheless nearer to it than any other religion. The final chapter on the *Further Determination of the Absolute* contains many suggestive and lofty thoughts which carry us into the region of what we may call a "rational mysticism."

We confess that we always open books with high-sounding titles with a certain amount of prejudice, which we generally find justified upon closer acquaintance. Such is our feeling with regard to *A Scientific Philosophy the Harbinger of a Scientific Theology*,¹ which has no author's name upon the title-page. We do not say that the volume does not contain some sensible things, but, if the theology offered is claimed as scientific, then we are compelled in the main to disagree with the writer. One purpose of this book, the writer tells us, is to place the great doctrines of Scripture upon a more satisfactory footing. Does he mean that Scripture doctrine is unsatisfactory and needs his assistance, or does he mean that certain doctrines alleged to be drawn from Scripture are unsatisfactory and that he can offer better ones? We presume it is the latter, but this is not what he says. We do not see, however, that the improvement he offers amounts to much; for he tells us, after

¹ *A Scientific Philosophy the Harbinger of a Scientific Theology; or, Steps to Philosophical and Theological Unity.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1901.

quoting from the Gospels, that "there ought to be no doubt from these passages that Jesus Christ was begotten miraculously by the Holy Ghost," and other things belonging to the same orthodox category. On the philosophical side we have an exposition of spirit-substance and the ethereal medium, which seems familiar to us; and his reference to the "old Scottish philosophy of common sense," and the use of terms which are rarely, if ever, heard in England, help us to localise the author as a North Briton. With one example of his manner of interpreting Scripture we will leave the author to his readers. The reference is to Christ turning water into wine. He says: "His object was not to please men, especially in animal gratification; and it is quite lawful to believe that in this case He ministered to a party who were in pecuniary difficulties, by giving that which could be turned into money." If so, even then we may remark that the wine would ultimately minister to some one's animal gratification. Not that we object to that in moderation.

In Mr. Welch's brief biography of *Anselm*¹ we have a most concise and admirable account of the great churchman and theologian. The story of his life is well told, and cannot be read without sympathy and interest; while an intelligent analysis of his principal theological writings enables the reader to appreciate the services he rendered to religion and the advance he made upon the cruder theories of earlier centuries.

In rather more than 400 pages, Mr. Adams gives an account of the lives of more than fifty *Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era*,² from St. Guthlac (A.D. 714) to St. Margaret of Scotland (A.D. 1093). It necessarily follows that most of the sketches are very brief, though a few, such as the accounts of Edward the Confessor and St. Dunstan, are much more ample. The volume contains a large number of illustrations, most of them being photographs from old pictures in the British Museum. We feel tempted to say that these illustrations are the best part of the book, though it is altogether a very good one of its class and admirably adapted for young people.

After the passing of the Toleration Act in 1689, which gave Dissenters, for the first time, liberty to practise public worship in their own way, they began to build chapels for themselves, in place of the barns, stables, and private rooms in which they had been accustomed to meet. It therefore happens that many of these chapels have recently completed their second century of existence, and in some cases, especially where the present congregations are Unitarian, this event has been marked, not only by a local celebration, but also by the production of a history of the

¹ *Anselm and his Work*. By the Rev. A. C. Welch, M.A., B.D. ("The World's Epoch Makers.") Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1901.

² *The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era* (Second Series). By the Rev. D. C. O. Adams, M.A. Oxford and London: A. R. Mowbray & Co.

chapel and its congregation. *Matthew Henry and His Chapel*¹ is a very good example of these historical accounts, which have considerable value for all who are interested in the history of Dissent in England. Matthew Henry's chapel was erected in Chester 1700 for the famous expositor, and Mr. Roberts gives a variety of interesting particulars concerning Henry, his family and his labours, and of various matters relating to the congregation up to the present time. The trust-deed of the chapel describes it as being for the use of "Protestant Dissenters," though it has sometimes incorrectly been called Presbyterian.

Senator Gaetano Negri, perhaps the greatest thinker of modern Italy, certainly the most clear-headed philosopher and writer of Italy, has written a book² which seems to excel, for philosophical and literary merits, any previous work of his. In this book Senator Negri deals with a subject which has lately received much more attention than it did for the previous fourteen centuries. He approaches his subject with no prejudices whatever. Having deeply studied the character of the man and of his times, he speaks of the Emperor Julian with knowledge and sincerity. Of Julian's genius and statesmanship, as an administrator and as a chieftain, he is a great admirer, and what he has to say on these two points clearly bears out the contention of the author that "Julian was a man of great intellectual power and determination, a born ruler of men, an upright and honest man, who would have somewhat retrieved the deplorable condition in which the Imperial Crown had fallen under his three predecessors." The author introduces the subject of his book in a most sympathetic, nay, enthusiastic way. He writes: "The fate of Emperor Julian was indeed miserable. No personality during the decaying period of the Roman Empire appears more original, more interesting, more attractive than his. But the ecclesiastical tradition was dead against him, and has marked him out with the stigma of 'Apostate,' and with such a mark he has been condemned to ignominy and obscurity. As always is the case in polemical works, truth had to be banished to make room for passion and party interest. But all the abuses and curses of the Church could not destroy the fact that both the personality of the Emperor and his actions are highly interesting, and that Julian was a very genial man, a man who having been suddenly called to a supreme military command, and to face a situation that seemed hopeless, in a very short time reveals himself a great general and sagacious administrator." The part of the book devoted to a biographical sketch of Julian is full of striking passages from the writings of the Emperor himself, and from the writings of some of

Matthew Henry and His Chapel (1802-1900). By H. D. Roberts. The Liverpool Booksellers' Company, Ltd.

² *L'Imperatore Giuliano L'Apostata*. Studio storico di Gaetano Negri. Hoepli, Milan. 1901.

his contemporaries. Julian had a great faith in the gods, he often appealed to them for counsel. Soon after he took the decision of usurping the Imperial Crown, he told his friends: "Last night a vision appeared before me and told me, 'Julian! more than once I stood at thy threshold, intending to increase thy power and dignity, but I had always to withdraw, being rejected by thee. If, even now, thou dost not receive me, I will leave thee, mortified and sad, but keep it in mind, this will be the last time I knock at thy door.'" The same vision re-appeared to Julian on the last night of his existence; it approached Julian's tent, and with a sad countenance lett it; Julian saw by that his hour had come. "That strong man," writes Senator Negri, "is not discouraged; the omen is against him, but fearless he goes to the battle, and an arrow pierced his noble heart." The author gives several quotations from the writings of those who were present, according to which the arrow was not a Persian one, but a Roman (Christian), *Julianum telo cecidisse Romano*. The last scene has been written by Ammianus, who was present, and who has recorded also the last speech of Julian. A few words from the same will show how this great Emperor died. "It has come," he said, "the moment for me to go, and as a willing debtor I am pleased to pay my debt to Nature. As the soul is worth much more than the body, we have rather to rejoice than be grieved when the better part separates itself from the worse part. I have nothing to repent; I am not sorry for anything I have done. Pleased and fearless I went there, where the mother Republic sent me, and I have always firmly withstood the adverse fate." In concluding this part the author says: "He was the last hero of Hellenism; he had raised up the flag of Hellenism, and for a little while he unfurled it, to fall again to the ground with his death, never to be lifted up again." If veritably great Senator Negri appears to be when he writes the history of that unhappy Emperor, not less great he appears when he enters boldly and well armed into the philosophical, metaphysical aspects of his subject, in the course of which he discusses of the discord among the Christians, the Neoplatonism (its origin, causes, and defeat), and of Julian's action against Christianity. This very interesting book closes up with two chapters—one on the character of Julian as a man and a prince, and the other containing a most interesting summing-up of the religious currents and under-currents of those days. Undoubtedly, from a philosophical point of view, the author appears to his best advantage where he describes the peculiar condition of the Christian Church, which even at that early period of its existence at Milan was pure, and at Constantinople it was already worldly and corrupted; and as for the character of the Christians of those days, he clearly shows that the "Apostate" Julian was much more of a Christian than his Christian

opponents. Two currents were then struggling, one against the other. The Hellenic and the Roman both had a substratum of Paganism, both wanted to turn to their account the teaching of the Gospels. The Neoplatonism strove to save the ancient Hellenism by introducing as much of the teaching of Christ as was compatible with their mythology; while the neo-Christianism strove to conquer the future by introducing into the new and simple religion of Christ as much Hellenism as was necessary to render the new religion attractive to the people. Julian was the exponent of the former; and as we have already seen, an arrow pierced his heart, and the last battle of Hellenism was lost for ever.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

MR. CHARLES CARRINGTON, the English publisher in Paris, has recently been heavily fined to the tune of £120 for advertising the reprint of *La Jeunesse rendue au Vieillard*, originally written in Arabic by Kamil Pasha to the order of Sultan Selim four centuries ago. It is said by Mohammed Abdul Futtah to be a scientific work. This judgment; we may add, is under appeal. We mention these facts because we have before us *Passion and Criminality in France: a Legal and Literary Study*,¹ by M. Louis Proal, a well-known criminologist. M. Proal holds a high position in the legal profession in France, being one of the presiding judges at the Court of Appeal of Riom, in the Puy-de-Dôme. As Juge d'Instruction in Paris, and as a public prosecutor and advocate, he has had a large experience at first hand with criminals and persons of degenerate types. As Laureate of the "Institute" M. Proal is well qualified for the literary side of this work, in which he displays a wide and extensive knowledge of the literature of his native land. The book is published by Mr. Carrington in Paris, and is translated by Mr. A. L. Allinson, an Oxford scholar. It is somewhat similar in its treatment to the *Psychology of Sex*, by Mr. Havelock Ellis; and notwithstanding its scientific character and high position of its author, we should not be at all surprised if in this country it meets with a similar fate to that of Mr. Ellis' book at the hands of some "respectable" magistrate, backed up by a loud-mouthed section of the British public, which makes up for what it lacks in real virtue by noisy and aggressive hypocrisy. Whilst this work is of peculiar interest to Frenchmen, inasmuch as it deals with circumstances and dangers inherent in

¹ *Passion and Criminality in France: a Legal and Literary Study.* By Louis Proal. Translated from the French by A. R. Allinson, M.A., Oxon. Paris: Charles Carrington. 1901.

French society, yet it contains innumerable lessons of vital importance to the welfare of all civilised communities. In the treatment of crime as determined by the sexual passions there is, of course, much that one would not place before young people of either sex with impunity, yet there is nothing prurient and nothing which is intended to incite, such as we find in much of the obscene literature so widely advertised. Indeed, if the majority of novels and poems were as harmless in this respect the world would be all the sweeter. Unfortunately, the British public rightly deserves its title of "canting" applied by our Continental neighbours, and in its thick-headedness fails to discriminate between a valuable scientific work like the present and a filthy society novel. But whilst attributing rightly much crime to the sexual passions, M. Proal does not forget how largely drink enters into the causes of crimes. Sexual passions are largely influenced by alcohol, and alcoholism has, says Mr. Proal, made appalling progress in Paris, and developed to an incredible degree the worst instincts of profligacy and violence. "While," he writes, "I was Judge at the Correctional Tribunal of the Department of the Seine, I found fully a half of all offences might be attributed to drunkenness." Much might be counteracted by judicious legislation, of which Norway is given as an instance. Increase of drunkenness and indecency, licence of the Press and the stage, are not, says M. Proal, the inevitable consequences of civilisation. To the sociologist and criminalologist, to the student of ethics and psychology, as well as to the general reader, this work may be confidently recommended as indispensable. We cannot conclude without congratulating the translator upon his excellent rendering.

The Life of a Century, 1800 to 1900,¹ by Mr. Edwin Hodder, is intended, as the author states in the preface, "to give a readable narrative of the state of Great Britain and her dependencies at the beginning of the nineteenth century, in relation to politics, religion, ethics, trade and commerce, art, science, philanthropy, sociology, sports and pastimes, and the drama, and to trace the developments of these subjects throughout the past hundred years." This intention has been admirably carried out by Mr. Hodder, and although the work is necessarily divided into sections, it is not a mere compilation made up of compartments without any relation to each other. In giving the life of the nation during this period, Mr. Hodder has kept well to the front its development and marvellous progress, and has preserved from first to last this main idea. No phase of our national life has been too small to escape attention, and the result is a story which is as entertaining as the most exciting fiction and much more wholesome. Of our earlier customs and manners and of the social condition of the masses Mr. Hodder gives

¹ *The Life of a Century, 1800-1900.* By Edwin Hodder. With Five Hundred and Nineteen Illustrations. London: George Newnes, Ltd. 1901.

a graphic picture, from which the most thoughtless will gain some idea of the wonderful contrast with present conditions. Throughout Mr. Hodder writes on broad, liberal lines and sound common sense. The illustrations, exceeding five hundred, are, on the whole, excellent, and form a valuable adjunct to descriptions of scenes and places of the past. The use of illustrations in aiding the memory is even now hardly understood. It cannot be doubted that they make more impression upon the young mind than is usually conceded, and for this reason they require to be carefully selected. The book will appeal most strongly to the younger generation, but the older will be glad to refresh their memories, and by its aid to recall forgotten events. It will make an eminently suitable Christmas gift-book.

VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

IN the *Glories of Spain*,¹ Mr. Charles W. Wood has added another highly interesting volume to his series of books dealing with Continental travel. We ourselves have seen just enough of Spain to make us long to see more, and the beautifully illustrated book before us, with its glowing descriptions of architecture and scenery, render this longing well-nigh irresistible. Mr. Wood has the zeal of an enthusiast for all that is really beautiful in nature or in art. He has the pen of a ready writer, he is keenly observant of all those small details which go to make up a beautiful picture, and he is able to transfer to paper in its most realistic form the impressions he has gathered. Starting from Calais quay we have passing glimpses of the Orléanais, the Touraine, La Vendée and the forests of the Landes—all of which we have ourselves travelled by road every inch of the way, and we know that Mr. Wood writes truly—an almost equal hurried passage through the ancient city of Carcassonne, through Narbonne with its unfinished cathedral, like that of Beauvais, a marvel of architecture; through Perpignan, the one time residence of the kings of Majorca; and then over the border to Gerona the Beautiful, and the tour commences in earnest. We cannot do more here than indicate the principal places visited. From Gerona to Barcelona and thence to Montserrat occupy many chapters in the telling, and there is much to tell worth knowing. Next we are taken to Manresa, the scene of Loyola's conversion; to Lerida, with its eventful history; and to Zaragoza and its cathedral, only second to that of Barcelona, which is the most perfect in Spain. Tarragona, the ancient Roman city, with its survivals from the

¹ *Glories of Spain*. By Charles W. Wood, F.R.G.S. With Eighty-five Illustrations. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: the Macmillan Company. 1901.

classical era mingled with the beautiful mediæval Gothic buildings—"dream fabricks," as Mr. Wood styles them—is followed by the ruined Poblet and Valencia, and so back to Barcelona. This book, however, is something more than a guide, even of the highest character. The author makes friends with all sorts and conditions of men and women, and by his own sympathetic character draws from each his life story, which is here set down in telling manner. Mr. Wood is gifted, too, with an ample fund of humour, adding a touch of lightness. If we have any criticism to offer, it is that in his descriptions of architecture there is just a little too much repetition, which tends to become tedious. The illustrations are really first-class, even for these days of improved processes.

MEDICAL.

*Use-Inheritance*¹ is the title chosen by Dr. Walter Kidd for a brief brochure dealing with facts he has observed in the hairy coats of animals which he considers inconsistent with the doctrine that acquired characters are not inherited. Though these facts, he admits, are not strictly those of use but rather to be referred to habit, they seem to demand an explanation. Dr. Kidd considers them to have arisen from habit in the ancestors of the animals—an interpretation which is Lamarckian, and therefore directly opposed to Weismannism. In the first part of his essay he describes the whorls found in the hairy coats of animals. They are easily observed in the horse or other short-haired animal. A whorl consists of a group of hairs radiating from a central point and merging into the adjoining streams of hair. The most familiar example is the star in the forehead of the horse, though this animal has constantly two others and often four. In other animals, three others have been observed. In man the formation on the vertex is most noticeable. The several whorls with the feathering and crests are shown in diagrams, and it is suggested that they are formed through the action of the underlying muscles, following which suggestion it is shown that they nearly all occur in regions where opposing traction is at work. They are never seen over the middle of a large muscle. In the second part of his brochure, Dr. Kidd considers the direction taken by the hair on the bodies of animals—not the general backward direction, but the slopes seen in different areas. Certain slopes may be termed normal, as they are found largely distributed ;

¹ *Use-Inheritance. Illustrated by the Direction of Hair on the Bodies of Animals.* By Walter Kidd, M.D., F.Z.S. London : A. and C. Black. 1901.

certain others are unusual or exceptional. Of these, the dorsal region in man shows a remarkable divergence from that of other mammals. This divergence Dr. Kild attributes to man's habit of sleeping on his side or back, and thus bringing into action the mechanical conditions for producing this unusual hair-slope; the constant pressure in the direction which is exercised during sleep being regarded as sufficient to produce the reversal of the usual slope. Other examples, of which the forearm is the most striking, are also given. From all the facts described the conclusion is drawn that, unless created originally with the form of life presenting them, the peculiarities must have been produced in ancestors by habit or use. The author considers that his facts amount to a refutation of the doctrine that acquired characters are never inherited.

The October number of *Tuberculosis* has been sent to us "for review." It is No. 9 of the journal, and No. 6 was noticed in the Review for April; these being the only two sent. This number is chiefly occupied with the recent congress in London, as to which the Museum was perhaps the most important part, and one which it is to be regretted could not be kept open for a few weeks longer. The number contains an article summarising the disputed question of the identity of tuberculosis in men and in cattle, and remarks on the various expressions of surprise in the newspapers at the statement made by Dr. Koch at the Congress—a statement which led to the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the subject. There are also reviews of three of the sections—scarcely so full as might have been anticipated in a journal devoted to the subject. The Circulars of the Local Government Board and of the Board for Ireland are also given. The official view that, pending the work of the Royal Commission, there should be no relaxation of the precautions hitherto taken, is one that commends itself to every one.

We have received the *Polyclinic* for February 1900! Rather late, particularly for the pages devoted to a diary of the month.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. OSCAR BROWNING has written an admirable *History of Europe in Outline* (1814–1848).¹ The Board of Education has selected as the historical subject for students in men's training colleges the history of Europe from the Restoration of the Bourbons to the Fall of the Monarchy in July. Mr. Browning has supplied a book which furnishes students with all the information needed within a modest

¹ *The History of Europe in Outline, 1814–1848.* By Oscar Browning, M.A. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.

compass. Indeed, the work will be useful to all students of history. The chapters on Greece and on the Revolution in Poland are marvellous examples of condensed and vigorous writing. Mr. Brown- ing has a complete mastery over the complicated facts with which he deals. It is to be regretted that this excellent book has no index.

The history of English gardening is a subject of great interest from an artistic as well as from a horticultural point of view. Mr. Reginald Blomfield's book, *The Formal Garden in England*,¹ deals with some of the most practical aspects of the question, and at the same time presents the reader with the æsthetic principles which underlie the theory of gardening. The garden designers of the seventeenth century maintained in garden design the habit of mind which they maintained in all the other arts. Garden design took its place in the great art of architecture. The result was a well-ordered harmony between English houses and English gardens—a harmony which nowadays has practically ceased to exist. Mr. Blomfield points out that "it has been the work of the last century to destroy this invaluable instinct," and that all it has offered in place of it has been "a habit of specialising which may sometimes arrive at technical excellence, but has assuredly lost us the architectural sense." The historical details given in the volume show the general character of the formal garden in England; and the author has wisely refrained from attempting to deal with every side of an exhaustive subject. He has not discussed in this work the proper methods of growing plants, flowers, and trees, as these matters are fully discussed in the various works on gardening. The horticulturist will be chiefly interested in the book on account of its historical character. Mr. Blomfield writes in an agreeable style. If the hand of the clock could be put back, and if we could imagine a volume of this kind by some time-transmuting magic placed in the hands of Horace Walpole, we might easily conceive that quaint lover of gardening dissenting from some of Mr. Blomfield's views, while at the same time acknowledging, "At any rate, he writ like a gentleman."

At the present time, when feminism has become a subject of such absorbing interest, the delightful volume, *Woman in the Golden Ages*,² by Amelia Gere Mason, will be read by thousands on both sides of the Atlantic. The book is dedicated "To the Representative Women of To-day." It is manifest that, as the writer herself says in her preface, "the work has been a labour of love." The history of the intellectual achievements of women in bygone days can only be written after long and deep research. It is by no means easy to picture with anything like exactness the lives of the women of

¹ *The Formal Garden in England*. By Reginald Blomfield, M.A., F.S.A., Architect. With Illustrations by F. Inigo Thomas, Architect. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

² *Woman in the Golden Ages*. By Amelia Gere Mason. New York: the Century Company. 1901.

classic times. Historians have not been too chivalrous to women. The few women who gained notoriety by either startling beauty or talent were frequently the object of unjust aspersions. Under the circumstances, Mrs. Macon has fulfilled her task with remarkable success. Her account of the women of Sparta and Athens is luminous, though not rigidly accurate. She is, perhaps, slightly prejudiced against such writers as Thucydides, who ignored women only because they rarely played a part in the great events of Greek history. To say that "the Attic women were slaves" may be true in a certain sense, but the "slavery" of the Athenian woman was freedom and happiness in comparison with the lives of the English working women of to-day. Aspasia, whose name is associated with that of Pericles, can scarcely be classed with the "hetærae." She was in much the same position as the wife of a man who had previously obtained a divorce from another woman would be in our time. We are not, moreover, to assume that all the Athenian wives were "respectably ignorant." The wives of some of the great artists of Athens must have been both beautiful and intellectual. They certainly furnished models for the noblest types of painted or sculptured loveliness. The essay on "The Revolt of the Roman Women" contains much food for thought. It is amusing to learn that "there never has been so prolonged and serious a commotion on the much-talked-of 'woman question' as in the Rome of two thousand years ago." The subsequent admission that "with possibly one exception, the points at issue were not quite the same as in the middle of the nineteenth century," to some extent qualifies the former statement. It is quite true that independence was the very keynote of Roman citizenship; and the women of Rome loved independence quite as ardently as men. Shakespeare has put into the mouth of Brutus the words, "Render me worthy of this noble wife," and, on the other hand, Portia is proud of being the "woman that lord Brutus took to wife." This was the high standard of mutual love and esteem which formed the basis of Roman domestic life. The stern virtue of the Roman matron was exemplified in the case of Lucretia. In some cases the display of austerity in such matters savoured of the ridiculous: for instance, Cato's decree erasing the name of a Roman from the list of senators because he kissed his wife before his daughters would be unworthy of the most Stiggins-like county councillor of latter-day London.

In addition to the essays on Greek and Roman women, there is an interesting account of the "First Convent," which includes a sketch of the famous Marcella, a study of the "Learned Women of the Renaissance," and a highly interesting essay on the "Salon and Woman's Club." The first sentence in the last essay is very striking: "It is not too much to say that the entire present generation of women is going to school." Here and there a note of warning is

struck against the mechanical progress of the women of the New World. "Why is it," she asks, "that lines too deep for harmonious thought are so early writing themselves in the tense, mobile, and delicate faces of American women? Why is it that the pure joy of life seems to be lost in the restless and insatiable passion for multitudes so often thinly disguised as love for knowledge, which is not seldom little more than the shell and husk of things?" Again: "What do we gain if we simply exchange one tyranny for another?" A well-deserved tribute is paid to the women of the French literary *salon* of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: "They did much more than form society, create a code of manners and set the fashions, which we are apt to look upon as their special province. They refined the language, stimulated talent, gave fresh life to literature, exacted a new respect for women, and held political as well as social and academic honours in their hands." It is claimed for the American woman that, though she may lack a little of "that elusive half-sensibility, half wit, which makes so much of the Frenchwoman's charm," she has what the Frenchwoman has not—"something that belongs to a race in which the ethical overshadows the artistic." Here the writer of this clever book is on dangerous ground. The American woman is quite "elusive" enough, and she has a singular charm of her own, but she lacks one thing that the women of other nationalities possess—modesty. We do not mean that the American girl or the American matron is not a "model of all the virtues," to use the expression of a gifted American author, but, instead of "hiding her light under a bushel," she generally waves a torch from the housetops. Perhaps intercourse with the best people of the old countries will tone down *la belle Américaine*. The interesting book before us suggests many reflections, and we need say no more except that the writer of it is evidently an accomplished, a learned, and a thoroughly logical-minded woman.

The third and fourth volumes of Dr. Dyer's *History of Modern Europe*¹ deal with the important period, or periods, extending from 1576 to 1789. The minute attention paid to details forms one of the great merits of the work. Mr. Arthur Hassall, who has revised and continued Dr. Dyer's work, is evidently endowed with a marvellous grip of facts. The chapter on the Thirty Years War throws much light on one of the most obscure events in the history of the seventeenth century. The account of Scandinavian history and the biographical sketch of Peter the Great will be read with deep interest by the student of history. The chapters dealing with Louis XIV. scarcely do justice to the masterful and splendid qualities of the Grand Monarque. Of course, Louis' faults are obvious to even the

¹ *A History of Modern Europe from the Fall of Constantinople*. Vols. iii. and iv. By Thomas Henry Dyer, LL.D. Third Edition. Revised and continued to the end of the nineteenth century by Arthur Hassall, M.A. London: George Bell & Sons.

most superficial observer of human nature. No English king, for the last three centuries at least, possessed the ruling capacity of Louis XIV. Cromwell was, indeed, a great ruler, but we know that he repudiated the name of king. The chapter dealing with the American war and the events preceding the outbreak of the French Revolution is rather scrappy. The last two volumes of the work will be looked forward to eagerly, for they will bring the history of Europe down to the end of the nineteenth century.

Mr. R. M. Johnston has written a very instructing book,¹ dealing with one of the most striking periods of the Italian National struggle for liberty and independence. The author has studied very deeply his subject; the sources of his information are great in number and of indisputable authority; and his book appears to be the outcome of an impartial, though sympathetic, study of men and things. It seems as if the writer had lived the life he so picturesquely describes, so great and telling is the *locale*. Moreover, for any statement of any exceptional importance, whether in favour or against the national cause, he gives in a footnote his authority for the same. For those who wish to be acquainted with that period of Italian history, and especially with the last spark of vitality of the Papal temporal power, we cannot suggest a better and more authoritative book than that now under our consideration. It covers the three years from the death of Gregory XVI. to the restoration of Pio Nono by means of the French bayonets. After a brief summary of the Middle Ages period, he then passes to describe the Theocracy under Gregory XVI.—a most deplorable and corrupt state of things—and the eventful election of Pio Nono. As the pages roll on the reader assists at the very striking phases of that period. The election of Pio is a victory of the National party, both against Austria and the Jesuits; the people for weeks and weeks acclaimed, day and night, the new Pope. Pio at the outset meant all he said; he had read Gioberti's *Primato*, and he thought he could play the part reserved in that book to an ideal Pope; but two great obstacles stood in his way—his own physical weakness and the strong opposition of the Jesuits. Under these unfavourable circumstances he yielded to the popular demand for a Constitutional form of government. But he could not do without his cardinals, and while in appearance the Government was in the hands of Constitutional Ministers, in substance the business of the State was carried on (as in the past) by the Theocracy, and behind the back of the Constitutional Ministers. On the occasion of the war against Austria of 1848, Pio firstly encouraged the same, then repented, or was made to repent. He was compelled to change Ministers almost monthly. At last he entrusted the power to Pelegrino Rossi, who was disliked by the

¹ *The Roman Theocracy and the Republic, 1846-1849.* By R. M. Johnston. London: Macmillan & Co. 1901.

Italians, because he was against the league with Piedmont and because of his Austrian sympathies. On the very day of the opening of Parliament Rossi was murdered, and the Papal Constitutional Government broke down. The Ministers were paralysed, the Chamber of Deputies lost all power, and the Pope fled the country, not because he was in danger of his life, but because he had lost all grasp of the Constitutional game. The Roman people left alone, the only thing they could do to put a little order into that chaos was to form a Convention, and at the third sitting of the same the Roman Republic was proclaimed, and the temporal power of the Popes was declared to have come to an end. Mazzini foresaw the possibility that Austria, Spain, and Naples would accept the Pope's appeal, but he expected that the French Republic, just proclaimed, would, if anything, assist the sister Republic. He was soon to be deceived on this point, as the French Republic landed at Civita-Vecchia an army to destroy the Roman Republic and to restore the Pope in Rome, against the will of the people. As a corollary to these events, the author gives a concise yet clear summary of what had happened in the meantime in the North of Italy, where the struggle for independence was headed by Charles Albert. After the reading of this authoritative and accurate account of those historical events, one cannot but come to the following conclusions: (a) That a Constitutional Government with the Pope at the head is an impossibility, because of the infallibility attached to the spiritual power, and because of the Jesuits, the arch-enemies of any Liberal form of government; (b) that the Roman Republic was an attempt bound to fail; and (c) that if the Republic had to be destroyed, it was well for the Italians that it was by the hands of the Frenchmen, who treated the Republicans with humanity, which would not have happened if the Austrian, the Spanish, or the Bourbon army had entered Rome instead.

THE DRAMA.

IRIS, A TYPE OF WOMAN.

MR. PINERO'S latest contribution to the so-called problem play is in some respects his best. The production of *The Second Mrs. Tanqueray* was generally felt at the time to mark an epoch, of which *Iris* is possibly the last word. Starting from that point, it is interesting to note the working of the dramatist's mind upon the topic that was very much "in the air" before the popular writer ventured to bring it before that very old-fashioned person, the average theatre-goer. Nora and Hedda Gabler, and other Ibsen ladies,

had already flashed and dashed before the devotees of theatrical "Independence" (save the mark!), but though Mr. Pinero, in "the Tanqueray" was felt at first to have gone "one better" than Ibsen, it was only at first! The Ibsenites, who, as usual, were adepts in the art of misunderstanding their master, exclaimed, "Lo, an English Ibsen!" A few more cautious persons held their peace and waited. It might be that Mr. Pinero was only playing "the game." Seeing, with that quickness to observe the wind from the straws that must ever be the quality of the successful dramatist, that a sort of "boom" was setting up in women of (at least) doubtful reputation, he may have said to himself cynically, "Well, if that's what they want, they shall have it!" And undoubtedly the appeal in "Mrs. Tanqueray" to curiosity on the one hand, and, on the other, to what was felt to be reality, said a good deal towards the success of the play. "Mrs. Tanqueray," given a playwright as technically skilled as Mr. Pinero, was bound to please certain audiences by its air of being, to put it vulgarly, "in the know." Then came *The Notorious Mrs. Ebbensmith*, an even more Ibsenish play, in fact the single example of a "Pinero" that I recall which has actually at all the flavour of Ibsen. However that may be, for some reason it did not "catch on." One suspects that apart from the author's name it would have been immediately damned. Indeed, he no doubt counts it among his failures. And so it was, for him! But mainly, because by that time the public generally was alive to the fact of Ibsen's existence, and coming across something they did not quite understand, immediately put it down to the Norwegian's baneful influence. As a matter of fact, the resemblance between the two dramatists is entirely superficial; they are actually poles asunder. Mr. Pinero, finding himself misunderstood, or for whatever cause, lay low for awhile, and when he next handled the topic—that sex question, which obsesses us all so terribly in these later days, he treated it from the man's point of view. Judging from the discussions one heard, there was ample room for difference of interpretation of *The Gay Lord Quex*. Many women were strongly repelled, while some thoughtful men were captivated. Now, at last, *Iris*, it seems to me, makes all things clear. Mr. Pinero is not, and never has been, a social reformer. One hopes, indeed, that he will some day give us a picture of what I will dare to call a "respectable" modern woman, with all the special characteristics of her type. It would be a harder thing, and all the more worth doing, perhaps. In the meantime we have *Iris*! She is quite ordinary from a woman's point of view. From a man's, she has the supremely distinguishing gift of beauty, and still more, that rarer charm so indefinable, yet so unmistakable, that makes nearly all men, and even a good many women, incline to make fools of themselves about her. She is rich, she does not care to know how rich,

and she loves, or thinks she loves, a poor man. But marrying again, according to her husband's will, she will lose her fortune, and her lover is worse than poor, a middle-class man, unemployed, and with all the luxurious habits of the rich. Iris hesitates, and engages herself to Freddy Maldonado, a sort of Jew, or some kind of foreign millionaire. This is false step number one.

The two men meet at Iris's house; "Maldo," as he is called, waits till the departure of the other guests, and then claims, naturally enough, his rights as an engaged man, to "make love" in a rather impassioned manner. Some instinct prompts Iris to acknowledge that though she is prepared to pass her life with him as a "true and faithful wife" she cannot abide his endearments, and, in fact, does not love him. This is false step number two! "Maldo" retires, the curtain drops and rises again to show an interval of time, and the young lover returns after midnight for a last—as he thinks—farewell. The natural result follows. Iris breaks off her engagement, and arranges to meet Laurence Trenwith in Switzerland, where they spend some months as man and wife, in all but the name, the situation being thinly disguised from their friends—and enemies. The omission of the marriage ceremony is of course necessary to preserve Iris's fortune. The young man at length rouses up his spirit, and entreats her to marry him at all costs. She is utterly foolish and reckless about money matters; he sees that at the rate she is living even her own property will soon be spent, and he is determined to wrench himself away, and carve out his own luck. Circumstances presently make his departure inevitable. Iris's lawyer turns out a scamp, and embezzles her property and that of several of her other wealthy friends. There is nothing for Laurence but the Californian ranch. A paltry £150 a year is saved from the wreck, on which Iris proposes to live, and in the meantime she announces her "engagement" to Laurence. The astute "Maldo," whose fortune is not involved in the general ruin, arrives with the warmest expressions of interest and congratulation to the happy pair. In reality he is preparing a revenge. Like the rest, he more than suspects (though the author does not make this point quite clear) Iris's real relation to the younger man. He offers her money. Every one sees that it is absurd to think of Iris living on the beggarly £150. She refuses in well-expressed terms. She has good sense enough to see, partly at any rate, how such a course is bound to end. "Maldo" leaves a cheque-book behind, as it were carelessly, after telling her that he has placed so many thousands to her credit, with his bankers. And—in a sudden impulse, she signs a cheque, as a gift to a former poor dependent! This is an excellent touch of character and dramatic effect, to which Miss Fay Davis' acting did full justice. It is, of course, false step number three! After this we are not surprised to find her in the next act, established as "Maldo's" mistress,

abandoned by her friends, and loathing the fruits of her conduct. Even now, "Maldo" offers to marry and make a respectable woman of her, and she is half tempted to consent. But she hears that Laurence has returned. She will tell him everything. He *must* understand how she has got into this trouble. She tells him the whole pitiable little history with its sordid details, which the audience now learns for the first time, and confidently awaits his forgiveness. She even mentions "Maldo's" wish to marry her. This (the revelation) is false step number four! Laurence says good-bye and forsakes her, one must charitably suppose, with the idea that "Maldo" will carry out his intention of marriage. But "Maldo," who has found the letter in which she appointed the meeting with Laurence, has been waiting for the result which he anticipates of their interview. He has had his revenge, and is now only bent upon asserting his mastery of himself and of her. He orders her out of "his" house, that very night. Half-stunned and wholly heart-broken, she obeys, and goes out without a word—one shudders to think to what inevitable fate! It will not be suicide—yet!

Iris is a fine play! The principal character strikes one as a real creation. As a sex play, it endorses the conventional view that woman's immorality is damnable, and man's virtue immaterial. Both the men despise Iris, pitilessly, for her weakness, of which each of them has taken advantage. Of course, the sympathy of the audience is enlisted for her, as one who "suffers much," but she is to be condemned, however pitiable. Such seems to be the playwright's verdict. There is no pretence, that she remains, in spite of all, a "pure" woman! Mr. Pinero is too sensible a man to admit such an absurd idea for an instant. Society is cruel to her, but her own character, or want of character, is the cruellest influence in her fate. It is a tragedy of temperament, not of destiny. From one point of view, the play might be taken as a terrible indictment of latter-day luxury. Love of luxury, the refusal to look the facts of life in the face, to accept the lot of the working-day world, is at the root of Iris's misfortunes. To onlookers, accustomed to a strenuous life, there is something almost absurd in her trivial difficulties. And yet, one knows that of such stuff as she, are made, essentially, all the "unfortunate" women, who nightly swarm the streets of our great cities. One may be as indignant as possible with "conventional" Society—its cruelty to women, its condoning of the fault of men. But, until the whole *Wesen* (the German word expresses it) of a certain proportion of women is radically altered, no change in laws or social habits, can benefit them much. As a moralist, Mr. Pinero holds up an awful warning to women of this soft, sensuous, good-natured, self-abandoning type. An alternative title of the play might well be "The Harlot's Progress." But the warning need not be assumed to belong only to women.

The curse of luxury eats into the heart of man, and brings destruction in one form or another to the whole community, regardless of sex. Lifeless as the other characters in the play are, there is a hint, in the young girl, Aurea Vyse, the only one to whom it occurs, at the time of misfortune, to be up and earning an honest living, of the direction in which salvation lies. To sum up, then, Mr. Pinero's work in social drama. In "Mrs. Tanqueray," he shows a woman, of a more robust conscience than Iris, it is true, but with the same basic nature, and—invariably, a tragic end. Her inherent excitability and restlessness—such as shows itself often in women who are technically "respectable"—is the ruin first of happiness—and finally of life itself. No refusal to "recognise" on the part of Society—an evil, by the way, to which every one in whatever position is more or less subject—has anything to say to her misery. "Mrs. Ebbsmith" is a rebel against society, of malice aforethought, and suffers definitely under her breach of the conventions. The dramatist is again, we take it, more concerned to show, that under existing conditions, a rebel is bound to suffer, than either to defend her, or to condemn the conditions. He depicts the natural consequences of such conduct, and leaves you to draw your own conclusions. In all this, he is very different from Ibsen, who for the most part invokes admiration, or at least sympathy, for the rebels. Again, in "Lord Quex," Mr. Pinero displays as cynically as possible, but again without express condemnation, the wild-oat-sowing man, reformed, as such as he can be reformed, and not suffering as women do, from his past life—apparently! The moral lesson here, if one must be drawn, is what we all know well enough, that the respect of the world does prevent a man from falling as low as he might otherwise. Quex, though a fallen man, is able to recover a certain measure of decency, because Society does not insist upon pushing him further down. The subject is treated in a lighter vein, and must be recognised as representing truthfully certain sides of life. That such things should be possible may well cause indignation, but indignation is not Mr. Pinero's *métier*. "You see yourself!" he would appear to say. "If you think that admirable—Well, you do!"

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. ANDREW LANG is an agreeable writer but not a good critic. His volume, *Alfred Tennyson*,¹ does not "hit off" the strong points of the poet. If we regard it as mere biography, it is readable; but really the world already knows quite enough about Tennyson's life.

¹ *Alfred Tennyson*. By Andrew Lang. ("Modern English Writers.") Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons.

Mr. Lang introduces some long prosy pseudo-theological discussions as to Tennyson's faith or unfaith which will interest nobody except a few clergymen and "cranks." The closing chapter, in which an attempt is made to define Tennyson's "precise rank in the glorious roll of the poets of England" (what an example of the twaddling style this is!) is singularly lame and impotent. Let us give Mr. Lang's own words: "We do not, or should not, ask whether Virgil or Lucretius, whether Æschylus or Sophocles, is the greater poet. The consent of mankind seems to place Homer and Shakespeare and Dante high above all. For the rest, no prize list can be settled. If influence among aliens is the test, Byron probably takes among our poets the next rank after Shakespeare. But probably there is no possible test. In certain respects Shelley, in many respects Milton, in some Coleridge, in some Burns, in the opinion of a number of persons Browning, are greater poets than Tennyson. But for exquisite variety and varied exquisiteness Tennyson is not readily surpassed." Could a more glaring proof be afforded of Mr. Lang's utter incompetence as a critic than this absurd passage? To compare Milton or Shelley with Tennyson is something like lunacy—or at least imbecility. Why ring the changes on Tennyson's "exquisite variety" and "varied exquisiteness?" Why waste precious words in this reckless fashion? Tennyson is really a great poetic artist, though not a great poet. Mr. Lang—who thinks Mr. Rider Haggard a novelist—does not appreciate such distinctions. In his criticism of *Maud*, Mr. Lang has made a great discovery. The hero of the poem is "merely the Master of Ravenswood in modern costume." This is Mr. Lang's incidental tribute to his literary idol, Scott. Now there is nothing in common between Scott and Tennyson. Scott's poetry would be tolerable, and so would his literary personality, if he had never written the Waverley Novels. Mr. Lang is just fifty years behind the age as a critic. His, indeed, is the criticism of fogeydom.

*A Man, a Woman, and a Dog*¹ is one of the most amusing books that we have ever read. Mr. Robert B. Suthers sees the absurd side of things very keenly. His onslaught on the follies of vegetarianism will make even vegetarians laugh. The humours of matrimony have never been better illustrated than they have in this exceedingly clever book.

*The Celtic Temperament*² is a fascinating volume of essays. We do not entirely agree with all Mr. Grierson's views. He is too severe on modern materialism, but there is much truth in his severe estimate of the music-hall. The readers of THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW are familiar with Mr. Grierson's style, which is lucid, forcible, and convincing. Every essay in the volume deserves to be studied

¹ *A Man, a Woman, and a Dog*. By Robert B. Suthers. London: Walter Scott.

² *The Celtic Temperament and other Essays*. By Francis Grierson. London: George Allen.

carefully. Mr. Grierson's "modernity" is one of his great charms. He has the power of saying exactly what he means and of seeing into the inmost truth of things. His exalted view of the Celtic temperament will win for him much sympathy, but he has scarcely done justice to the masculine qualities of the Teuton. Some of the "Reflexions" at the end of the volume are really profound. For instance: "Nothing revives our waning illusions like the promise of a life which flatters our weaknesses."

*An Album of Adventures*¹ is a good collection of boys' stories. There is not much of the adventurous element in some of them. "Dagnerous to Cyclists" is a misleading title, for the "danger" is more imaginary than real. "The Knight of the White Ribbon" is perhaps the best story in the book. All the narratives are entertaining if not original, and the book will sustain Mr. Hope's high reputation as a writer of boys' stories.

*Tom the Piper's Son*² is an old-world child's story. Mr. George Allen has brought out a charmingly illustrated edition of this nursery tale, and the artist, T. Buller Stoney, has produced some most amusing and ingenious pictures. The book ought to be welcome to the young at Christmastide.

Circumstance,³ by Dr. Weir Mitchell, is a very interesting study of American life. The character of the adventuress, Mrs. Hunter, is admirably portrayed. The heroine, Kitty Morrow, is a good-natured but weak and impressionable girl. The story is told with great *esprit*, and there are some striking scenes here and there, but the *dénouement* is rather unsatisfactory.

*A Friend with the Countersign*⁴ is another good American novel. It deals with the period of the Civil War. Mr. B. K. Benson has succeeded in depicting General Meade's camp with much vividness, and the adventures of the hero, Jones Berwick, are most dramatically related.

Mr. Rudyard Kipling is one of those writers who have won popularity by pandering to the basest and most vulgar instincts of the English people. His new book, *Kim*,⁵ is perhaps his most ambitious effort as a novelist. The scene of the story is laid in India, and it must be acknowledged that Mr. Kipling knows more about Indian than about English life. Nevertheless, as a novel, the book is a ghastly failure. The boy Kim and the Lama are the only two characters in the story that have the slightest resemblance to human beings. The construction of the plot is wretchedly defective. In fact, a schoolboy who had read a dozen standard works of fiction, could easily have fashioned a more coherent and harmonious plot.

¹ *An Album of Adventures*. By Ascott R. Hope. London: A. and C. Black.

² *Tom the Piper's Son*. Illustrated by T. Butler Honey. London: George Allen.

³ *Circumstance*. By S. Weir Mitchell, M.D. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

⁴ *A Friend with the Countersign*. By B. K. Benson. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd. New York: the Macmillan Company.

⁵ *Kim*. By Rudyard Kipling. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.

But, of course, even Mr. Kipling's warmest admirers—for he has many admirers amongst the great army of the illiterate and half-educated—would not claim for him the gifts of the late Wilkie Collins. The question remains—does Mr. Kipling possess the higher faculty of character-painting or psychological analysis? In our opinion he does not. If he understands the *bizarre* habits and ideas of the Hindoos, he has failed to grasp the "true inwardness" of Hindoo life. He is a superficial observer and a slipshod writer. His short stories of Indian life are his best productions, but, taken as a whole, they are too sketchy and unfinished to give him any real claim to a place in literature. He is not an artist in the true sense of the word. His ideal of life is a very low one—the notion that physical strength and the love of domination constitute heroism. Such a view of man's destiny and aspirations is only worthy of a hobbledohoy or a Hooligan. *Kim* is a crude, inartistic novel, but it is, perhaps, the best that Mr. Kipling can write.

Sœur,¹ by M. Henri Ardel, is a novel in which there is, perhaps, a little too much overstrained emotion. The sorrows of the beautiful Ghislaine are certainly not unreal sorrows, for poverty and friendlessness are the hardest ordeals that a girl of good family may have to face in a plutocratic age. The story is written with great power and tenderness, though it tends too much to produce an impression of gloom on the reader's mind.

*La Colonne*² is a thrilling story of the Commune. The scenes describing the excitement produced amongst the old soldiers at the "Invalides" by the Communist outbreak are splendid in their simple realism. M. Desclaves is not blind to the faults of the would-be emancipators of France after the "débâcle" of 1870-71, but he presents us in these pages with some of the nobler aspects of the struggle in which the Communists played such a striking and dramatic rôle.

The new section of the *Oxford English Dictionary* (Vol. V., KAISER-KYX),³ concludes the letter K, and completes the fifth volume, of which it also contains the title-page and preface. In the letter K there are no less than 3569 words recorded in the dictionary. In *Johnson's Dictionary* there were only 205 words in the same letter, and in *Faul's Standard Dictionary* there were 2071. Some of the words in K are of very great importance. Take, for example, the word "King." More than two pages (making about seven columns) of the dictionary are devoted to this word. There is some obscurity as to the relation in form and sense of "king" to *kin," and the explanation given does not throw much light on the subject.

¹ *Sœur*. Par Henri Ardel. Paris: Librairie Plon-Nourrit et Cie.

² *La Colonne*. Par Desclaves. Paris: Librairie Plon-Nourrit et Cie.

³ *The Oxford English Dictionary*. A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by Dr. J. A. H. Murray. (KAISER-KYX.) Vol. V. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.

*The Secret Orchard*¹ is one of the most powerful and dramatic novels it has ever been our pleasure to read. The action of the story takes place in the Château de Fitzroy or "Luciennes," and there is not a scene which is not full of deep human interest. The authors, Agnes and Egerton Castle, possess the rare art of producing a perfect illusion. The follies of the Duke of Cluny do not prevent us from realising the peculiar charm of his personality. This charming but faithless descendant of the royal house of Stuart has all "the defects of his qualities." He betrays a young girl whom he regarded as a "devil," because she had eyes whose glamour was to him irresistible. The endeavour of the Duke and of his friend Favereau to prevent the Duchess from discovering the truth fails miserably, because of the Duchess's own scheme of adopting a young girl who turns out to be the Duke's victim. In the tragic *dénouement* Cluny displays the bravery, nobility and real kingliness of his race. The character of Helen, the Duchess of Cluny, is, perhaps, to use a vulgar saying, "too good for this world." The American sailor, George Dodd, is a very fine study of human nature, as modified by Transatlantic influences. The Canon and the Doctor are two admirable figures, and they play in the story the part of a Greek chorus. The portrait of the passionate girl, Joy or Gioga, is not altogether natural. The fault of the book as a novel is that it creates the impression of being a mere narrative version of a play. On the stage *The Secret Orchard* can scarcely fail to be a success. The standpoint of fiction is, however, very different from that of the acting play. The book, though readable and intensely interesting, cannot rank very high as literature. It belongs rather to the same category as *The Woman in White* or *Uncle Silas* rather than to that of *Esmond* or *Romola*. Moreover, the style shows too much devotion to French models. The passages in which soliloquy is indicated by italics might well have been omitted. The ungrammatical expressions "from thence" and "from whence" are frequently used throughout the book. But, in spite of its literary shortcomings, this novel is one which will be read with deep interest by thousands, and it is safe to predict that the book will have an enormous sale. Mr. Egerton Castle has the gift of the true story-teller. If he aimed less at effect, and more at fidelity to life, he might perhaps have produced a work of much higher literary merit. As it is, in conjunction with the lady whose name appears on the title-page, he has written a very attractive story from the sensational point of view.

We have the authority of Mr. Rudyard Kipling for the fact that "Mr. Guy Boothby has come to great honours now." The author of *The Light that Failed* adds, with characteristic refinement, that "his books sell like hot cakes." It is sad to reflect that the public,

¹ *The Secret Orchard*. By Agnes and Egerton Castle. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

whose appetite can be satisfied with bad confectionary, can also assuage its intellectual hunger with such fiction as that supplied by Mr. Guy Boothby. The literary taste of the British public must, indeed, be at a very low ebb when such a book as *Farewell, Nikola!*¹ is even printed. It may be possible that intelligent publishers know the difference between first-rate fiction and unadulterated rubbish; but, of course, a publisher is a man of business, and must cater for the buyers of books. It is, however, the duty of every honest critic to speak plainly when worthless trash is, as an American publisher recently put it, "rammed down the throats of the public." Mr. Guy Boothby has created a monster in the person of Dr. Nikola. If the monster turned out another Frankenstein, it might eventually be fortunate for this misguided manufacturer of hobgoblin stories. It might show him, from the standpoint of literary ethics, the "error of his ways." But, alas! we live in an age when even the novelist has become a mere money-grubber, and the love of artistic beauty, the desire of attaining perfection, can no longer be regarded as the inspiring motives of the writer of novels. The scene of the story is laid in Venice. Apparently the author has been in Venice; but there is absolutely no human element in the book. Dr. Nikola is a grotesque masquerader who never had even a shadow of counterpart in real life. He is not even a decent ghost of the imagination. Sir Richard Hatteras, the supposed narrator of the story, is a mere lay figure. Miss Trevor is a colourless nonentity, and we are sorry, for the reputation of Englishwomen, that she is "one of those girls" that "England alone is able to produce." She is the daughter of a dean, who turns up at the end of the book, and who talks platitudes. She appropriately closes her career by marrying a duke. This ducal personage seems to us only an amorous counterjumper in disguise. The proceedings of Dr. Nikola in the murder-haunted Palace Revecce can only be described as a tissue of ridiculous improbabilities. If Nikola were anything, he must have been an audacious quack, and the various persons, ostensibly of the educated class, whom he deluded must be looked upon as fools, or rather as unhappy mortals afflicted with softening of the brain. Of literary merit, originality, or characterisation of any kind the book is absolutely devoid. And yet Mr. Kipling, the great creator of Private Mulvany, and the poet of the drunken sailors of Camden Town, informs a listening world that such books "sell like hot cakes." The public which could digest Mr. Rider Haggard's atrocities and Mr. Kipling's puerilities may be expected to swallow Dr. Nikola. Terrible must be the mental dyspepsia of this poor public! Can we wonder that it should seek for a desperate outlet in Jingoism and unlimited beer?

Arrowsmith's Annual for Christmas, 1901, is entitled *Patricia at*

¹ *Farewell, Nikola!* By Guy Boothby. London: Ward, Lock & Co., Ltd.

the Inn!¹ It is an exciting and deeply absorbing story of the days of Cromwell. The author, Mr. J. C. Snaith, has the art of ingeniously interweaving history and fiction. The scenes at the "Sea Rover" are such as may have actually occurred, though the *dénouement* savours too much of the tragic farce. The story will certainly add to Mr. Snaith's reputation as a writer of historical romance.

Père,² by André Lichtenberger, is a charming and pathetic story. A young girl discovers that she is the offspring of her mother's amour with a man whom she had met after her marriage. The man whom she had regarded as her father was not really her father, and she knew it. At first she revolted at the discovery. Then she longs to see her true father. She is brought face to face with him at a dinner given by an old lady who knew and loved her. She finds that he is a coarse sensualist and a heartless votary of vice. Then she learns from her friend that her dead mother's husband had heard the entire truth from his weak wife's lips, that he had forgiven the erring one, and that he had devoted his life to the education of the child of whom he was not the father. The young girl finds that this terrible lesson has made her feel prematurely old. She pities her mother, whom she tenderly refers to as "ma petite maman" in her diary. She feels like one recovering from an amputation, prostrated but determined to live. Besides, she has some one to live for, a true hero, the man who was to her more than a father. Such is the outline of this beautiful, tender, touching story, the moral of which may be favourably compared with the Gradgrind etics of our English writers of "novels with a purpose." It is a slender plot, but the style is limpidly simple, and the entire book is free from affectation. It is, indeed, one of the most exquisite specimens of French fiction that has appeared for many years.

An excellent edition of Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*³ has been published by Messrs. Allman & Son. Mr. Lees, the editor, has done his work admirably.

POETRY.

It is to be regretted that a clever writer should adopt verse as a vehicle of expression when the appropriate medium is prose. This remark applies forcibly to Mr. Heather Bigg's exceedingly interesting work, *Nell: a Tale of the Thames*.⁴ We are told in the preface that the present volume is "only the middle one of a trilogy."

¹ *Patricia at the Inn*. By J. C. Snaith. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

² *Père*. Par André Lichtenberger. Paris: Librairie Plon.

³ *Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar*. By John Lees, B.A. London: J. Allman & Son, Ltd.

⁴ *Nell: a Tale of the Thames*. By Heather Bigg, F.R.C.S. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd.

Even so, the "tale" should have been told in prose. The author has expressed himself with great force and originality in blank verse. Nevertheless, the story would have been more effective if told in the form of a novel. The naturalness of the narrative is impaired by the cumbrousness of blank verse. The strange and tragic history of the principal characters in the story would impress the reader more poignantly if recorded after the fashion of *Tess of the d'Urberrilles* or *Rhoda Fleming*. Mr. Heather Bigg has great sympathy with human frailty and profound knowledge of life. His work is one that cannot fail to arrest attention; but, owing to its inappropriate form, we fear it cannot take a high place as literature.

The Poet Laureate has in his drama, *England's Darling*,¹ done full justice to the character of Alfred the Great. The cheap edition issued for the Millenary Anniversary of Alfred's death should be acceptable to the many admirers of the great Saxon king. There are some very fine passages in the drama, and the employment throughout of language which is, for the most part, what is colloquially termed Saxon, is in harmony with the period in which the scenes of the drama take place. The tendency to depreciate Mr. Austin, so noticeable in the columns of some of our cheap newspapers, is only another proof of the presumption and lack of critical acumen of the average journalist of to-day. If not a poet of the highest rank, Mr. Austin is certainly one of the most gifted of living English poets. His love of nature, his exquisite taste, and his delightful lyricism entitle him to take a permanent place amongst the poets of England. Some of the lyrics in *England's Darling* have a quaint, homely beauty; for example, Edward's song, of which the opening lines may be quoted:

"Sing, throstle, sing,
On the hornbeam bough;
But tell not the King
Of a maiden's vow.
When the heart is ripe,
Then the days are fleet:
Pipe, throstle, pipe!
Sweet! sweet! sweet!"

Of the strong passages in the drama, perhaps the best is the speech of the king, beginning:

"Tis not for length of days,
No, but for breadth of days that we should crave."

Even those who have no sympathy with the Poet Laureate's Jingoism must recognise—unless they belong to the class of persons who cannot see the merits of a poet when his politics are opposed to their own—that he is no mere writer of doggerel, like Mr. Kipling, but

¹ *Alfred the Great: England's Darling*. By Alfred Austin, Poet Laureate. London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

one who has both the "divine afflatus" and the "accomplishment of verse." Mr. Austin is worthy to rank close beside his two great predecessors, Wordsworth and Tennyson.

A short selection of *Sonnets*,¹ reprinted from the poems of the late Archbishop Trench, has been made and designed by Alice J. Romilly. The little volume is most artistically designed and executed. Some of these sonnets have quite a Wordsworthian ring. For example, the sonnet beginning:

"A wretched thing it were to have our heart
Like a thronged highway or a populous street."

ART.

THE latest volume in Messrs. Bell & Sons' handy series of "Great Masters in Painting and Sculpture" is signed by the well-known name of Leader Scott. Following the thorough method of the series, it gives the life and a detailed description of the art work of the great *Brunelleschi*.² It is he who marked the final turning-point of mediæval art from Gothic to classic tradition. The Renaissance did not continue to advance along his lines, but it was he who gave the first triumph of the awakening. This is sufficiently brought out in the present volume in the chapters "Filippo learns from the Ancients," and two others on the "Great Dome." As master of men, city architect, church-builder, palace-builder and military engineer, the career of the artist, in whose brain so much of the Weltgeist was thinking, is followed out. Perhaps the views of Rio—an art historian now seldom quoted, but whose own sympathies enabled him to understand the inner workings of Brunelleschi's mind—might have been taken into consideration. It is also confusing to the reader innocent of Italian to find a constant change in the form of the name—now "Brunellesco," the same as his father's name, which is right enough, and common in French, and now "Brunelleschi," which is the common form in English, and means that he was of the family *dei* Brunelleschi.

The larger series, made up of fairly complete works on the great masters, has been followed up by a charming collection of little books, each dealing with a single painter in about seventy pages of print, with eight plates from photographs. This is "Bell's Miniature Series of Painters,"³ beginning with masters so noteworthy and so notably distinct as Fra Angelico, Velazquez, and Burne-Jones. The execution of the series is excellent.

¹ *Sonnets*. By Richard Chevenix Trench, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co.

² *Brunelleschi*. By Leader Scott. ("Great Masters in Painting and Sculpture.") London: George Bell & Sons. 1901.

³ Bell's Miniature Series of Painters. *Fra Angelico, Velazquez, and Burne-Jones*. London: George Bell & Sons. 1901.

INDEX.

ANDERSON, J. D. The Indian Famine (*Independent Section*), 45.

Attenborough, J. M., Samuel Barr, 54.

Art, Contemporary Literature of, 115, 355, 474, 716.

BAYLEE, J. Tyrrell, Army Nursing Reform and Men Nurses, 255.

Bayliass, W. J., The State *versus* The Man, 40.

Belles Lettres, Contemporary Literature of, 109, 231, 355, 467, 592, 711.

Berkeley, G. F. -H., The Cost of 230,000 Fighting Men, 117.

Blaker, Hugh, American Politicians, 15.

Blind, Karl, A King's Name, 241.

-----, Max Müller (Personal Reminiscences), 529.

Brand, Willh. F., Chamberlainia ; or, England Before, During, and After the War, 262.

Burgh, Ashley de, Civil Service Inequalities and Abuses, 547.

Burnell, Acton. Religion and Theology, 329.

C., E., The Indian Famine, 133.

Chesterton, Gilbert, The Queen, 237.

Corbet, W. J., Can a War of Aggression be Justified ? 274.

-----, What Should England Do to be Saved ? 604.

Cosby, Dudley S. A., "Should a Roman Catholic University be Established in Ireland ?" 293.

-----, The Compulsory Expropriation of Irish Landlords : A Reply to Mr. T. W. Russell, 647.

DOVE, Christopher C., Is the Sense of Duty the Offspring of Self-Love ? A Study in Ethics, 541.

Drama, 472.

FORD, Charles, When the Indefinite is the True, 177.

Frid, E. Wanless, The late Rev. H. R. Haweis, 568.

G., G. P., Imperialism and Liberty, 126.

Garrod, H. C., The Break-up of the Party System (*Independent Section*), 209.

Gasquoine, C. P., Science and Religion : A Rejoinder, 92.

Gibson, James A., The Open Window, 191.

-----, Halt ! 576.

Gill, Frances Tyrrell, Woman Liberalism, 130.

Gordon, Harold, A Future for War Office Reform, 244.

Grove, Lady Agnes, Mispronunciation and Middle-Classdom, 337.

HAGUSH, The Annual Report of the Lunacy Commissioners, and the Lord Chancellor's Lunacy Bill, 86.

Hewitt, J. F., Historical Calendars, 45.

History and Biography, Contemporary Literature of, 106, 227, 355, 467, 590, 709.

Modgkin, Howard, Pennsylvania and South Africa : A Contrast, 614.

Hopkins, T. M., Capital Punishment, Ineffectual and Mischievous, 141.

Husband, E. B., Where are We Now ? 477.

JINGO, ANTI-, The Working Classes and Conscription, 519.

Justitiæ, Vindex, A Message from the Cape, 357.

KERR, S. P., What are Immoral Plays ? 441.

LADLAW, Allan, *Morbid Actors*, 439.

Lang, R. T., *The Hope of the Liberal Party*, 370.

Leigh, J. C., *The United States and Europe: A Suggestion*, 285.

Leonard, W. A., *The Myths of Greece*, 432.

MADDOCK, A. E., *Materialism and the Unknowable: an Excursion into the Debatable Land*, 163.

Medical, *Contemporary Literature*, 100, 347, 466, 706.

Meredith, J. Creed, *Popular Observations concerning the Ridiculous*, 687.

Milligan, Alice L., *Some Notable Irish Elegies*, 150.

Morley, Ernest, *Hooliganism and Working Boys' Clubs*, 560.

NAUGHTEN, T. E., *Exit Liberal Catholicism*, 311.

-----, *Why Not Irish Volunteers?* 515.

-----, *The Roman Catholic University Problem viewed from the Standpoint of a "Bigot,"* 672.

Navy, *Our Defenceless*, 258.

PHILOSOPHY and Theology, *Contemporary Literature of*, 97, 219, 345, 459, 578, 699.

Poetry, *Contemporary Literature of*, 114, 235, 596, 715.

ROSE, E. B., *Our Treaty Relations with the Boers—How have we observed them?* 485.

SAVILLE, S. E., *Jamaica*, 315.

Science, *Contemporary Literature of*, 96, 218, 343, 577, 697.

Seal, Horace, *Seal's Science of Status*, 171.

Sibley, N. W., *Companies Acts 1900*, 70.

Sillard, Robert M., *Our Inimitable Diarist*, 323.

Simpson, J. F., *The Philosophy of Tradition*, 555.

Sociology, Poetics, and Jurisprudence, *Contemporary Literature of*, 102, 222, 349, 462, 585, 702.

Stanley, Thomas, *The New Humanitarianism*, 414.

Swiney, Frances, *An Ethical Birth-Rate*, 550.

THOMASSON, Franklin, *On War and Trade*, 1.

-----, *Political Principles*, 366.

-----, *Land Ownership or the Right to Land*, 523.

Todhunter, Maurice, *German Wayside Flowers*, 136.

-----, *Heinrich von Treitschke*, 679.

Townshend, R. B., *Rome and her Dutch Rebels*, 386.

"True Friend of Better England, A," *Astounding Revelations about the South African War*, 597.

Tugman, F. W., *Policy of Grab, Jingo or Pro-Boer*, 624.

VECCIA, G. Dalla, *The Roman Quarrel*, 402.

Voyages and Travels, *Contemporary Literature of*, 106, 226, 589.

WHITE, F. A., *The World's True Heirs; or, True and False Imperialism*, 491.

Wolff, Henry W., *The "Polish Danger" in Prussia*, 375.

-----, *The Housing Question and the Savings Banks*, 631.

